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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the results of a feasibility analysis completed for the intersection of Madeline Avenue at Nova Road, located in the City of Port Orange, Volusia County, Florida. This report was prompted by an application by the City of Port Orange to evaluate the feasibility of construction of the following improvements along Madeline Avenue:

- Extend the existing westbound and eastbound left turn lanes
- Add exclusive eastbound and westbound right turn lanes

The purpose of constructing exclusive right turn lanes and extending the left turn lanes is to reduce delays for turning vehicles and through vehicles and to assist in maintaining the functional capacity of Madeline Avenue.

Based upon the crash analysis, qualitative assessment, field observations, intersection analysis, Benefit/Cost ( $B / C$ ) analysis, engineering judgment, and input from FDOT, both short-term and long-term considerations are recommended to improve the safety and operation of the study intersection. The short-term improvements are developed in coordination with FDOT and can be constructed as soon as possible. The long-term improvements include the extension of left turn lanes and addition of exclusive right turn lanes on eastbound and westbound Madeline Avenue and other improvements that will be constructed along with these capacity enhancements.

## Short-term Recommendations

- Replace the existing permissive-only left turn phase for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements with a protected-only phase. The protected-only left turn phase is recommended because concurrent eastbound and westbound left turn movements cannot be accommodated safely at the study intersection. A separate structural analysis of the existing mast arms must be completed before the installation of three-section signal heads for the eastbound and westbound protected-only left turn phases.
- Increase pedestrian safety with improved lighting (Please note that this recommendation was included in the intersection lighting project (FPID 439881-1) along Nova Road)
- Install flexible retroreflective backplates for all signal heads
- Install ADA-compliant detectable warnings on pedestrian ramps
- Install FTP-68B-06 sign panels to replace sign stickers at pedestrian pushbuttons
- Refresh yellow median nose painting and install reflective pavement markers (RPMs)
- Add guide striping for all the four left turn movements

The short-term considerations are illustrated in Figure ES-1.

## Long-term Recommendations

- Extend the existing eastbound left turn lane to a storage length of $\mathbf{2 9 5}$ feet and provide an exclusive right turn lane with a storage length of $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ feet as shown in Figure ES-2. Based on the conceptual designs of the proposed improvements, it is anticipated that the eastbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would not need additional ROW. Please note that for the eastbound proposed improvements, the northside roadway edge (along Madeline Avenue) was held to minimize right-of-way impacts and the proposed concept strives to provide an efficient design.
- Extend the existing westbound left turn lane to a storage length of 270 feet and provide an exclusive westbound right turn lane with a storage length of $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ feet as shown in Figure ES-3. It is anticipated that the westbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would need additional ROW of approximately 0.209 acres.
- Reconstruct traffic signal to meet current FDOT standards
- Install pedestrian detector stations with new pushbuttons to meet ADA criteria for the following:
o West leg at the northwest and southwest corners
o East leg at the northeast and southwest corners
o North leg in both directions in the median
o South leg at the southeast corner
- Install intersection lighting to meet horizontal and vertical illuminance criteria per current FDOT standards as mandated when reconstructing a signalized intersection

The long-term modifications can be implemented at an approximate construction cost of $\$ 1,162,410$ (2025 value) and yields a B/C ratio of 8.4 which indicates that the anticipated benefits outweigh the estimated costs for this recommended alternative.
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## INTRODUCTION

VHB, Inc. was retained to perform a feasibility analysis study for turn lane improvements at the intersections of Madeline Avenue at Nova Road, located in the City of Port Orange, Volusia County, Florida, as illustrated in Figure 1. This study was initiated by an application by the City of Port Orange to evaluate the feasibility of the below improvements at the study intersection:

1. Extend the existing westbound and eastbound left turn lanes
2. Add exclusive eastbound and westbound right turn lanes

As mentioned in the feasibility application, the intent of the proposed improvements is to reduce delays for turning vehicles and through vehicles by allowing increased stacking area to segregate vehicles departing Madeline Avenue from through traffic and to assist in maintaining the functional capacity of Madeline Avenue.

The analysis methods used in completing this study are consistent with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the Manual on Uniform Traffic Studies (MUTS), the Traffic Engineering Manual (TEM), Florida Department of Transportation (FDOT) Design Manual (FDM), and engineering judgment. The remainder of this report documents existing conditions, vehicle and pedestrian counts, qualitative assessment, crash analysis, intersection analysis, B/C analysis, and recommendations. The analysis will not only consider the benefits and feasibility of extending the left turn lanes and addition of right turn lanes at the study intersection as mentioned above, but also safety and other intersection improvements.

The current document is revised to address the comments received from the City of Port Orange, Volusia County, River to Sea Transportation Planning Organization (R2CTPO), and FDOT on the draft report submitted in February 2022. The responses to comments are provided in Appendix A-1.
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## EXISTING CONDITIONS

## Field Inventory

The intersection of Madeline Avenue at Nova Road is in the City of Port Orange, Volusia County, Florida. The characteristics of the study intersection are presented in Table 1. Figure 2 depicts the existing conditions including the general roadway geometry, pavement markings, land use, and intersection traffic control of the study intersections. The conditions stated in this report reflect conditions as observed on the date of the qualitative assessment.

Table 1: Field Inventory

| Features | Madeline Avenue at Nova Road |
| :--- | :--- |
| Main Street | Madeline Avenue (east-west); two lane undivided urban major collector |
| Minor Street | Nova Road (north-south); six lane divided urban principal arterial |
| Intersection Type | 4-legged intersection |
| Number of Intersection <br> Approach Lanes | Northbound - 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes \& 1 shared through/right turn lane <br> Southbound - 1 left turn lane, 2 through lanes \& 1 shared through/right turn lane <br> Eastbound - 1 left turn lane $\& 1$ shared through/right turn lane <br> Westbound - 1 left turn lane \& 1 shared through/right turn lane |
| Roadway <br> Maintenance | Madeline Avenue - City of Port Orange <br> Nova Road - FDOT |
| Traffic Control | Signal |
| Speed Limit | Madeline Avenue - 25 mph (west leg)/35 mph (east leg) <br> Nova Road - 50 mph |
| Bicycle Lanes | No bicycle lanes on Madeline Avenue <br> Exclusive bicycle lanes are provided on Nova Road in both directions |
| Sidewalks | Madeline Avenue (west leg) - full coverage on south side of the roadway, partial coverage on <br> north side <br> Madeline Avenue (east leg) - full coverage on north side of the roadway only <br> Nova Road - full coverage provided on both sides of the roadway |
| Surrounding Development | Northwest: BP Gas Station and Convenience Store <br> Northeast: Vacant Land <br> Southwest: Mobil Gas Station/7-Eleven Convenience Store <br> Southeast: Port Orange Stables |
| Nearest Signalized |  |
| intersections | Madeline Avenue - No signalized intersection to the east <br> Madeline Avenue \& Clyde Morris Boulevard - 1.27 miles to the west <br> Nova Road \& Reed Canal Road - 0.75 miles to the north <br> Nova Road \& Herbert Street - 0.51 miles to the south |
| Roadway Lighting | Streetlights - northwest corner of the intersection (mounted on a utility pole) |



## Traffic Volume Data

Two 24-hour volume approach counts were collected - one on Madeline Avenue west of Nova Road and the other on Nova Road, south of Madeline Avenue, on 12/07/2021, representing a typical commuter weekday. The 24 -hour volume traffic counts were supplemented with 8 -hour intersection turning movement counts (TMCs). The TMCs were collected between 7:00 AM - 9:00 AM, 11:00 AM - 1:00 PM and 2:00 PM - 6:00 PM at the study intersection. These hours represent the highest eight hours obtained from the volume counts. From this data, the AM and PM peak traffic hours were found to occur from 7:30 AM to 8:30 AM and 4:30 PM to 5:30 PM. The overall peak hour for the intersections was found to occur during the PM peak hour. The TMCs revealed that traffic along Madeline Avenue peaks in the eastbound direction during both AM and PM conditions and the traffic along Nova Road peaks in the northbound direction during the AM peak hour and southbound direction during the PM peak hour. The 24 -hour volume count, 8hour TMCs and pedestrian/bicycle counts are provided in Appendix A-2. The Table $\mathbf{2}$ summarizes the distribution of turning movements at the study intersection.

Table 2: 8 Hour Turning Movement Percentages (All Vehicles)

| Study Intersection | Movement | Northbound | Southbound | Eastbound | Westbound |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Madeline Avenue at <br> Nova Road | Left turn/U-turn | $13.10 \%$ | $5.06 \%$ | $25.27 \%$ | $20.61 \%$ |
|  | Through | $83.29 \%$ | $84.84 \%$ | $30.94 \%$ | $51.09 \%$ |
|  | Right-turn | $3.61 \%$ | $10.11 \%$ | $43.79 \%$ | $28.31 \%$ |

The field collected 2021 TMCs were compared and adjusted based on the 2019 TMC data provided by the County for AM and PM peak hours. Figure $\mathbf{3}$ provides the 2021 AM and PM peak hour turning movements counts for the study intersection.

## Existing Operational Analysis

The existing operating conditions were determined using Synchro 11 software. The signal timing information was provided by Volusia County. Table $\mathbf{3}$ summarizes the intersection delay, levels of service (LOS), and volume over count (V/C) ratios at the study intersection during the AM and PM peak periods. The synchro results are provided in Appendix B. As shown in Table 3, eastbound and westbound approaches along Madeline Avenue were found to operate at LOS D or E.
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Table 3: Existing Operational Analysis Results for Madeline Avenue at Nova Road

| Approach | Existing AM |  |  | Existing PM |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Delay <br> (sec/veh) | LOS | V/C <br> Ratio* | Delay <br> (sec/veh) | LOS | V/C <br> Ratio* |
| Eastbound | 57.8 | E | 0.78 | 72.3 | E | 0.85 |
| Westbound | 54.1 | D | 0.67 | $64 . .2$ | E | 0.70 |
| Northbound | 27.3 | C | 0.65 | 31.9 | C | 0.81 |
| Southbound | 28.0 | C | 0.45 | 33.1 | C | 0.59 |
| Overall | $\mathbf{3 3 . 8}$ | $\mathbf{C}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{3 9 . 3}$ | $\mathbf{D}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 5}$ |

Note: * V/C Ratio - Volume over count ratio; The maximum value is reported for each movement and the overall intersection

A lost time adjustment of 3.0 seconds was added to eastbound and westbound left turn lanes to replicate the field observed queues for these movements. A summary of the pedestrian and bicycle LOS analysis at the signalized study intersections is included in Table 4. As shown in this Table, both the pedestrian and bicycle modes are found to operate at LOS D or better during both the AM and PM peak hours. The pedestrian and bicycle LOS values reported are based on the HCM $6^{\text {th }}$ Edition methodologies. Pedestrian LOS at a signalized intersection is based on factors such as the number of traffic lanes crossed, disturbance caused by motorized vehicle traffic (traffic volumes, turning types, etc.), and the presence of channelized right turns. The bicycle LOS at a signalized intersection is based on factors such as the presence of bicycle lanes and/or paved shoulders, separation from motorized vehicle traffic, traffic volumes and speeds, and heavy vehicle percentage.

Table 4: Existing Multimodal Analysis Results for Madeline Avenue at Nova Road

| Peak <br> Period | Pedestrian Mode LOS |  |  |  | Bicycle Mode LOS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| AM Peak | B | B | C | C | D | D | B | B |
| PM Peak | C | B | C | C | D | C | B | B |

## Left Turn Phase Warrant Analysis

Based on FDOT's input, a left turn phase warrant analysis was performed for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements. It should be noted that since the left turn phase warrant analysis is outside the current study scope, data that was not collected for this warrant analysis was borrowed from the Left Turn Phase Warrant Study completed by FDOT for Nova Road and Madeline Avenue in 2019. The analysis results for the eastbound left turn movement show that the warrant is satisfied based on left turn delay estimated by Synchro. However, the warrant is not satisfied for the westbound left turn movement. The recommendation for a consideration of a protected phase for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements in the existing conditions is discussed in the following sections of this report. The warrant analysis sheets are provided in

## Appendix B.

## Crash Data

The latest available five years of crash data (from January 1, 2017 to December 15, 2021) at the study intersections were obtained from Signal Four Analytics. Raw crash data is included in

## Appendix C.

As shown in Table 5, there were 64 crashes reported within the influence area of the Madeline Avenue at Nova Road intersection. They consisted of 25 rear end, 13 left turn, 8 sideswipe, 8 angle, 5 off road, 2 right turn, 1 rollover, 1 other, and 1 pedestrian/bicyclist related crashes. The crashes caused 27 injury crashes and 1 fatality and total damages amounted to approximately \$9,550. One fatality occurred in the year 2020 and 1 pedestrian/bicyclist crash occurred in 2021. 66\% of the crashes occurred in daylight conditions and the remaining $34 \%$ crashes occurred in dark or dusk conditions. Pavement condition was dry for 55 crashes, and wet for 9 crashes. In addition to the significant number of rear end crashes (which are typical at a signalized intersection), a significant number of left turn and angle crashes were also observed at the study intersection.

Fatality Crash (\#24032474), August 8, 2020: A vehicle making EBL was struck by a vehicle travelling SBT at the intersection. After being struck, the turning vehicle spun onto the curb, ejecting the driver in the process.

Pedestrian/Bicyclist Crash (\#89398892), August 6, 2021: A bicyclist attempted to cross Nova Road diagonally from the north median island to the southwest corner, facing away from traffic. The southbound travelling vehicle had a green signal, striking the cyclist in the middle of the travel lane.

Table 5: Madeline Avenue at Nova Road - Crash Summary (01/01/2017 and 12/15/2021)

| Crash Type | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total | Proportion |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rear End | 5 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 25 | 39\% |
| Head On | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Sideswipe | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 13\% |
| Rollover | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2\% |
| Angle | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 13\% |
| Left Turn | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 20\% |
| Right Turn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3\% |
| Off Road | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 8\% |
| Pedestrian \& Bicycle | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2\% |
| Animal | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2\% |
| Total | 11 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 64 | 100\% |
| Crash Severity | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total | Proportion |
| Fatality | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3\% |
| Injury | 6 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 27 | 82\% |
| Property Damage Only | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 15\% |
| Total | 7 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 6 | 33 | 100\% |
| Pavement Condition | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total | Proportion |
| Wet | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 14\% |
| Dry | 10 | 9 | 12 | 13 | 11 | 55 | 86\% |
| Slippery | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Total | 11 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 64 | 100\% |
| Light Condition | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total | Proportion |
| Daylight | 8 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 42 | 66\% |
| Dusk | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3\% |
| Dawn | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| Dark | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 20 | 31\% |
| Total | 11 | 9 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 64 | 100\% |
| Under the Influence | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 | Total | Proportion |
| Alcohol | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6\% |
| Drugs | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2\% |
| Total | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 8\% |

## QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

A qualitative assessment (QA) was conducted at the study intersection in the field to evaluate the existing operating conditions occurring on a typical weekday, and to identify areas where improvements would be potentially beneficial to the overall safety and efficiency of the location. A registered professional engineer performed the QA during the AM and PM peak hour periods (including school opening and closing times). The field observations are summarized as follows:

## Traffic

## AM Peak Period (7-9 AM)

- Substantial queueing was noted along both the eastbound and westbound approaches (Madeline Avenue), with heavier traffic on the westbound approach. Vehicle queueing of up to 18 vehicles was observed on the westbound approach with less frequent congestion on the eastbound approach (up to 10 vehicle queues were observed).
- Notably, the heavy conflict between westbound through movements and eastbound left turn movements would frequently result in eastbound left turning vehicles entering and waiting in the intersection and completing the movement after the end of the phase. Similar situations also occurred for the westbound left turning movement, albeit less frequently.
- In some instances, eastbound and westbound queues were not cleared by the end of the phase. It was also noted that the available left turn storage on these approaches were not exceeded, most likely because of the through/right turn movement queues blocked the left turning vehicles.
- It is noted that vehicles exiting the Mobil driveway onto the eastbound approach were blocked by the queued through/right turn movement vehicles, however the Mobil exiting traffic was generally low and did not result in any significant conflicts.
- Very little congestion was observed along the northbound and southbound approaches (S Nova Road), with one exception. The northbound left turning vehicles were observed to exceed the available storage length by one or two vehicles in some instances.
- No drivers were observed skipping the queue to enter the left turn storage. Drivers along Nova Road generally travelled much faster due to the higher speed limit, available capacity, and lack of congestion.


## PM Peak Period (3-5 PM)

- The observations on the westbound approach were similar to the AM observations, however it was noted that the eastbound approach experienced heavier traffic and queueing (up to 18 vehicles). Similar issues were observed with up to three vehicles waiting in the intersection to perform the permitted eastbound left turn.
- Queue storage for the eastbound left exceeded during several cycles (up to 8 vehicles).
- On the northbound and southbound approaches, queues of up to 10 vehicles were observed, however were able to clear the intersection in a single cycle.
- Due to the heavier eastbound queuing in the evening, it was common to see commuters skipping the through/right queue, travelling through the median or opposite lane to enter the left turn storage. Similar speeds were observed for the approaches as in the AM peak.


## Paint and Signage

Pavement markings and signage on Nova Road are in fair condition, however, the pavement markings on Madeline Avenue are faded. Pedestrians/bicyclists crossing Nova Road must cross in two stages because of the existing width of the roadway. The eastbound and westbound left turn movements operate under permissive phase only. It was also noted that reflective backplates were not installed on signal heads.

## Pedestrians and Cyclists

No pedestrians or cyclists were observed crossing any approach in the AM or PM periods, most likely because of the absence of significant pedestrian/bicycle generators near the study intersection.

## ADA Related Observations

Curb ramps are present and at an acceptable slope, with median refuge provided in the center of Nova Road. Pushbuttons are provided on the corners of the intersection and on the median refuges. Curb ramp warning pads appear to have been previously installed at the intersection corners but have since been completely removed.

## FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS

## Background

The City of Port Orange submitted an application to perform a feasibility study to construct the following improvements along Madeline Avenue at Nova Road:

1. Extend the existing westbound left turn lane and eastbound left turn lane
2. Add an eastbound right turn lane and a westbound right turn lane

The purpose of constructing exclusive right turn lanes and extending the left turn lanes is to reduce delays for turning vehicles and through vehicles by allowing increased stacking area to segregate vehicles departing Madeline Avenue from through traffic and to assist in maintaining the functional capacity of Madeline Avenue. As per the pre-scoping meeting held on September 14,2021 , there was also a discussion about the future traffic volume growth due to the potential developments in the northeast and southeast corners of the study intersection (shown in Figure 4). In addition to the capacity improvements, safety improvements are also considered in this study and are explained in the following sections of this study.

Figure 4: Potential Developments - Madeline Avenue at Nova Road


## Site Assessments for Proposed Improvements

This section provides a brief assessment of the sites that can be considered before constructing the proposed roadway improvements. To construct exclusive right turn lanes, the following elements will need to be accounted for:

## Eastbound

- A parcel agreement will be needed to reconstruct the driveway and harmonizing treatments
- Existing inlet needs to be modified to a manhole and a new inlet constructed at the proposed curb line
- Removal of +/-30" oak tree
- Reconstruct SW corner ramps and update pedestrian features.
- Existing signal adjustments
- Pavement markings
- Underground utilities cannot be determined, but above ground evidence is as follows:
o Waterline and Sewer
o Miscellaneous irrigation


## Westbound

- To provide a 12-foot border width per FDM 210.7.1, an eight-foot-wide swath of private property will need to be acquired for right-of-way use. The agreement will need to include driveway reconstruction (south parcel) and harmonizing treatments
- North Side: Two existing inlets need to be modified to a manhole and two new inlets constructed at the proposed curb line
- South Side: Extend pipe run/MES 250 linear feet to the east with one new inlet constructed at the proposed curb line
- Existing signal adjustments
- Reconstruct northeast corner ramps and update pedestrian features
- Relocate aboveground utilities, 6 poles
- Underground utilities cannot be determined, but above ground evidence is as follows:
o Gas line
o Waterline


## Methodology

The methodology for determining the feasibility of implementing the proposed improvements includes performing a comparison of before (No-Build) and after (Build) operating conditions at study intersection utilizing traffic operation analysis software (Synchro 11) and preparing a B/C analysis for the proposed improvements. The No-Build condition represents the existing intersection configuration, and the Build condition represents the capacity improvements as well signal improvements.

It should be noted that short-term signal and ADA improvements (that can be built by FDOT as soon as possible) are also included in the study recommendations, for which a B/C ratio was not calculated.

## Future Traffic Development

The development of traffic projections for the study intersection required the examination of historical growth, proposed development levels within vicinity, and a basic understanding of local traffic circulation patterns and travel characteristics. As such, the following sources were used to derive reasonable future traffic forecasts.

- Population Projections: The population estimates obtained from the most current Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR), Florida Population Studies, Volume 54 Bulletin 189, dated April 2021 was used. The low, medium, and high population projections for 2045 are summarized in Table 6. The growth rates between 2020 and 2045 population projections range from approximately $0.07 \%$ percent to $1.62 \%$ percent per year for Volusia County. BEBR population study data is included in Appendix D.
- Historical Traffic Trends Analysis: Historical traffic trends analysis based on least squares regression analysis was conducted for the study roadways using traffic data from the 2019 Volusia County Traffic Count Program. The trends-based annual growth rate is calculated at $0.1 \%$ and $0.3 \%$ for Nova Road north and south of Madeline Avenue, respectively. This analysis was not conducted for Madeline Avenue because traffic count data was not available for last seven years. The trends analysis sheets are provided in Appendix D.
- Approved Developments: The project trips from the potential developments in the northeast and southeast corners of the study intersection with a build-out date of 2025 were added to the background traffic. It was assumed that $25 \%$ of the developable area will be developed by Year 2025.

Table 6: BEBR Population Growth

| County | $\mathbf{2 0 2 0}$ | Future Year 2045 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Projection <br> Type | Population <br> Projection | Annual <br> Growth <br> Rate |
|  | 531,588 | Low | 561,900 | $0.07 \%$ |
|  |  | Medium | 662,000 | $0.80 \%$ |
|  |  | High | 774,300 | $1.62 \%$ |

The following assumptions were made per the stakeholder meeting held on January 4, 2022:

- Based on a comparison of annual growth rates from the two primary sources (BEBR population estimates, and historical trends analysis), a simple annual growth rate of $1.0 \%$ was used to derive the year 2025 background turning movement volumes (from the year 2021 volumes).
- $25 \%$ of the project trips from potential developments along Madeline Avenue (full access) and $75 \%$ along Nova Road (right in right out only) were added to the background trips for the year 2025.

Figure 5 provides the 2025 AM and PM turning movement volumes for the study intersection. All the supporting documents - including the BEBR report, TRENDS analyses, future land-use and zoning, Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation sheets, and background plus project trip calculations are provided in Appendix D.
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## 2025 Operational Analysis

The 2025 operational analysis was performed for the proposed alternative at study intersection for before and after conditions. The before conditions assume that there is no change in intersection geometry and signal timings, whereas the after conditions assume improvements under the proposed alternative. As used for the existing conditions analysis, the 2025 operating conditions were determined using Synchro 11 software. Table 7 summarizes the intersection delay and LOS at each study intersection for before (No-Build) and after (Build) conditions during the two peak periods.

The following recommended storage lengths are determined based on operational analysis and using a total deceleration distance of 145 feet for a design speed of 35 mph in urban conditions:

- Eastbound Left Turn - 295 feet
- Eastbound Right Turn - 220 feet
- Westbound Left Turn - 270 feet
- Westbound Right Turn - 220 feet

A summary of the pedestrian and bicycle LOS analysis at the signalized study intersections is included in Table 8. As shown in this Table, both the pedestrian and bicycle modes are found to operate within LOS D during both the AM and PM peak hours. The synchro results are provided in Appendix E.

Table 7: 2025 Operational Analysis Results for Madeline Avenue at Nova Road

| Approach | 2025 AM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  | 2025 PM Peak Hour |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before (No-Build) |  |  | After (Build) |  |  | Before (No-Build) |  |  | After (Build) |  |  |
|  | Delay <br> (Sec.) | LOS | V/C Ratio | Delay <br> (Sec.) | LOS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { V/C } \\ & \text { Ratio } \end{aligned}$ | Delay <br> (Sec.) | LOS | V/C Ratio | Delay <br> (Sec.) | LOS | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { V/C } \\ \text { Ratio } \end{array}$ |
| Eastbound | 103.9 | F | 1.25 | 39.9 | D | 0.74 | 75.5 | E | 0.89 | 50.9 | D | 0.79 |
| Westbound | 65.1 | E | 0.79 | 36.2 | D | 0.64 | 89.4 | F | 1.14 | 54.9 | D | 0.69 |
| Northbound | 29.3 | C | 0.67 | 32.1 | C | 0.64 | 36.4 | D | 0.82 | 37.5 | D | 0.82 |
| Southbound | 28.8 | C | 0.53 | 36.2 | D | 0.63 | 40.9 | D | 0.68 | 43 | D | 0.81 |
| Overall | 41.6 | D | 1.25 | 34.8 | C | 0.74 | 47.4 | D | 1.14 | 43.1 | D | 0.82 |

[^0]Table 8: 2025 Multimodal Analysis Results - Before and After

| Peak <br> Period | Pedestrian Mode LOS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Bicycle Mode LOS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | EB | WB | NB | SB | EB | WB | NB | SB |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | B | B | C | C | D | D | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | C | B | C | D | D | D | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{2 0 2 5}$ Build (After) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| AM Peak | C | B | C | C | D | D | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |
| PM Peak | C | C | C | D | D | D | B | B |  |  |  |  |  |

## B/C Analysis

$A B / C$ analysis was performed for the study intersection based on traffic operational and safety benefits for the proposed improvements. To determine the benefits, the year 2025 operational analysis results for the No-Build and Build conditions and the adjusted year 2025 improvements cost were used. The following sections describe the overall process.

## Traffic Operational Benefits

To estimate the operational benefits of the proposed intersection improvements, Synchro reported networkwide measures of effectiveness (MOEs) were used. The operational benefits of the proposed intersection improvements are defined in terms of annualized cost savings associated with reductions in the following two MOEs:
o Total Delay (Vehicle-Hours)
o Fuel Consumption (Gallons)
The benefits were calculated for 300 days in a year for eight hours per day (4 hours each for AM and PM peak periods) accounting for reduced benefits anticipated due to lower traffic volumes during the weekend. The value of delay time per hour (\$20.17) and fuel cost (\$4.11) were obtained from "2021 Urban Mobility Report" published by Texas A\&M University and "AAA gas prices (as of $4 / 20 / 2022$ )", respectively. Table 9 summarizes the unit value of each MOE in a tabular format along with its source.

Table 9: Unit Value of MOEs

| MOE Values | Unit Value | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Delay (\$) | 20.17 | 2021 Urban Mobility Report published by Texas A\&M Transportation <br> Institute (TTI) |
| Fuel (\$/gal.) | $\$ 4.11$ | AAA Gas Prices (as of 2/3/2022) |
| Days per Year | 300 | Average days with observable AM, Mid \& PM peaking characteristics |

## Safety Benefits

Historical crash method as specified in the 2022 FDM was used to calculate the safety benefits of the proposed signal improvements. For this study, safety benefit associated with changing the permissive-only to protected-only left turn phase for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements was used in the B/C analysis. A Crash Reduction Factor (CRF) of 99\% was used based on Crash Modification Factor (CMF) ID 333 from the cmfclearinghouse.org for angle crashes. In addition, all the left turn crashes on Madeline Avenue were also assumed to be corrected with the proposed signal improvements.

## Improvement Construction Costs

The estimated roadway and signal improvements cost for the Madeline Avenue at Nova Road intersection improvements is $\$ 1,162,410$ (2025 value) and it has a corresponding annualized cost amounting to $\$ 85,553$. Table 10 summarizes the cost estimate in today's (2022) dollar value as well for the next three years based on the latest available FDOT highway construction cost inflation factors published on July 1, 2021.

Table 10: Adjusted Cost Estimates based on FDOT Highway Construction Cost Inflation Factors

| Fiscal Year | Inflation Factor | Multiplier | Adjusted Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Base | 1.000 | $\$ 1,070,358.98$ |
| 2023 | $2.70 \%$ | 1.027 | $\$ 1,099,258.68$ |
| 2024 | $2.80 \%$ | 1.056 | $\$ 1,130,299.09$ |
| 2025 | $2.90 \%$ | 1.086 | $\$ 1,162,409.86$ |

Table 11 summarizes the benefit cost analysis for the proposed improvements. The analysis yields a $B / C$ ratio of 8.4. The cost estimates can be found in Appendix F. Please note that potential right-of-way (ROW) cost is not included in the B/C analysis. The service life for the modification is assumed 20 years and the interest rate used in the calculation of annualized costs is assumed $4 \%$, which is a value frequently used by the FDOT in their benefit cost computations. Based on the conceptual designs of the proposed improvements, it is anticipated that the eastbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would not need additional ROW. However, it is anticipated that the westbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would need additional ROW of approximately 0.209 acres. Please note that for the eastbound proposed improvements, the north roadway edge was held to minimize ROW impacts.

## Conclusion

The calculated $B / C$ ratio indicates that the anticipated benefits outweigh the estimated costs for the proposed modifications, with operational benefits derived through reduced costs associated with lower delay and fuel consumption and safety benefits through costs associated with less crashes.

Table 11: Madeline Avenue at Nova Road - B/C Analysis Results

| Proposed Improvements | Total Benefit (Operational + Safety ${ }^{1,2}$ | Annualized Construction Cost ${ }^{3}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | B/C Ratio ${ }^{4}$ |
| - Extend eastbound left turn lane <br> - Add an exclusive eastbound right turn lane <br> - Extend westbound left turn lane <br> - Add an exclusive westbound right turn lane <br> - Replace permissive-only phase with protectedonly phase for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements | \$720,247 | \$85,553 | 8.4 |

## Notes:

1) Operational benefit is based on the year 2025 intersection analysis of the proposed roadway improvements
2) Safety benefit is based on the mitigation of angle/left turn crashes from the implementation of protected phase
3) Annualized construction cost is based on 2025 values and is based on a total cost of $\$ 1,162,410$, interest rate of $4 \%$, and service life of 20 years for the proposed improvements
4) ROW cost is not included in the $B / C$ analysis

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the crash analysis, qualitative assessment, field observations, intersection analysis, $B / C$ analysis, engineering judgment, and input from FDOT, short-term and long-term improvements are recommended to improve the safety and operation of the study intersection. The short-term improvements are developed in coordination with FDOT and can be constructed as soon as possible. The long-term improvements include the extension of left turn lanes and addition of exclusive right turn lanes on eastbound and westbound Madeline Avenue and other improvements that will be constructed along with these capacity enhancements.

## Short-term Recommendations

- Replace the existing permissive-only left turn phase for the eastbound and westbound left turn movements with a protected-only phase. The protected-only left turn phase is recommended because concurrent eastbound and westbound left turn movements cannot be accommodated safely at the study intersection. A separate structural analysis of the existing mast arms must be completed before the installation of three-section signal heads for the eastbound and westbound protected-only left turn phases.
- Increase pedestrian safety with improved lighting (Please note that this recommendation was included in the intersection lighting project (FPID 439881-1) along Nova Road)
- Install flexible retroreflective backplates for all signal heads
- Install ADA-compliant detectable warnings on pedestrian ramps
- Install FTP-68B-06 sign panels to replace sign stickers at pedestrian pushbuttons
- Refresh yellow median nose painting and install reflective pavement markers (RPMs)
- Add guide striping for all the four left turn movements

The short-term considerations are illustrated in Figure 6.


## Long-term Recommendations

- Extend the existing eastbound left turn lane to a storage length of 295 feet and provide an exclusive right turn lane with a storage length of $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ feet as shown in Figure 7. Based on the conceptual designs of the proposed improvements, it is anticipated that the eastbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would not need additional ROW. Please note that for the eastbound proposed improvements, the northside roadway edge (along Madeline Avenue) was held to minimize right-of-way impacts and the proposed concept strives to provide an efficient design.
- Extend the existing westbound left turn lane to a storage length of $\mathbf{2 7 0}$ feet and provide an exclusive westbound right turn lane with a storage length of $\mathbf{2 2 0}$ feet as shown in Figure 8. It is anticipated that the westbound approach improvements on Madeline Avenue would need additional ROW of approximately 0.209 acres.
- Reconstruct traffic signal to meet current FDOT standards
- Install pedestrian detector stations with new pushbuttons to meet ADA criteria for the following:
o West leg at the northwest and southwest corners
o East leg at the northeast and southwest corners
o North leg in both directions in the median
o South leg at the southeast corner
- Install intersection lighting to meet horizontal and vertical illuminance criteria per current FDOT standards as mandated when reconstructing a signalized intersection

The long-term modifications can be implemented at an approximate construction cost of $\$ 1,162,410$ (2025 value) and yields a B/C ratio of 8.4 which indicates that the anticipated benefits outweigh the estimated costs for this recommended alternative.





## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A-1:
Responses to Comments

# Feasibility Study for Turn Lane Improvements on Madeline Avenue at 

## Nova Road

## Responses to Comments received on the Draft Report submitted in February 2022

## Responses to City's Comments

1. Page 3 Paragraph 6 includes the word "eastbound" describing the exclusive right turn lane to be consistent with the description of "westbound" turn lanes in the next paragraph.

Response: The word "eastbound" will be included in the revised report.
2. It doesn't seem that anticipated cost to acquire additional ROW was included in the cost estimate and Benefit Cost Analysis.

Response: As mentioned in the report and based on the approved scope, the anticipated ROW cost is not included in the B/C analysis.
3. Is any comparison used to determine effectiveness of proposed brick and mortar improvements compared to timing adjustment of lights? Possible east and then west only phases which would allow either side to empty all staging vehicles instead of overlapping? Alternative technology is available that can hold the "dedicated" green arrow for any left turning vehicles staged instead of forcing them to wait until the end of a phase?

Response: Under the current conditions, the eastbound/westbound left turning vehicles are stopping in the middle of the intersection and then completing the turn at the end of the eastbound/westbound phases because of the permissive-only phases for the side street. As part of this study, a protected phase is recommended to be added to the eastbound/westbound left turn movements to avoid this existing situation. As mentioned in the report, this recommendation is based on field observations as well as crash data. To determine the effectiveness of the capacity and signal improvements, a Build (or After Scenario) analysis was conducted and compared to the No-Build (Before Scenario) and the operational benefits were reported in the Section - 2025 Operational Analysis. Moreover, a $B / C$ analysis was also conducted to quantify the capacity and signal improvement benefits.

Please note that any modifications to the signal phasing will have to go through FDOT (and adjacent signals along Nova Road will also be considered).
4. They do not allude to the capacity or the current level of Service (LOS) being a percentage of a calculated capacity. Recommendation to improve is being based off of cost benefit and not expansion of the capacity of the intersection.

Response: Please note that $B / C$ analysis is based on the benefits of the capacity improvements. The benefits of the Build (with the proposed improvements) over the No-Build (existing configuration) are measured by 3 factors - delay, total stops \& fuel consumption. Table 11 shows the reduction in delay, number of stops, and fuel consumption in the Build alternative compared to the No-Build alternative.
5. Page ii - The approximate cost listed doesn't distinguish if it includes design and construction: Text says "modifications can be implemented at an approximate cost"; if just construction costs estimated, suggest changing text to "approximate construction cost"

Response: The text will be updated to "approximate construction cost".
6. Page ii - There are 2 items for "consideration"; ADA issues \& triangular island. How do we get these included in the design?

Response: The ADA issues listed in the report will be taken care of as part of the short-term improvements - which most likely will be built by FDOT along with the short-term signal improvements. The long-term ADA considerations will be included in the revised cost estimate. The recommendation related to the triangular island is a consideration (which will have a minor construction cost) that may require coordination with the associated business owner, which is outside the scope of this study. As such, this specific recommendation will not be included in the revised report.
7. Page 8 - Should the Field Inventory include who is responsible for maintenance?

Response: We will update the Field Inventory Table to include the roadway maintenance agencies. Based on available information from Volusia County, the roadway maintenance agency for Madeline Ave is the City of Port Orange while FDOT maintains Nova Rd.
8. Does the study include the existing volume to capacity ratio? If so, please assist in locating this; this is required documentation for the TPO's Implementation Application.

Response: The existing V/C ratio information is in the Synchro Reports provided in Appendix $B$. The V/C ratios will be highlighted for easy reference in the updated report.
9. The Feasibility Study does not appear to inventory, address, or make statements regarding any surrounding infrastructure or stormwater drainage conditions that might be impacted by the improvements.

Response: Please note that this is a planning level feasibility study, and a field survey was not conducted to make statements regarding the surrounding infrastructure or stormwater drainage conditions that may be impacted by the proposed improvements. However, brief text regarding these impacts will be added to the revised report based on a desktop review of the study location.

## Responses to County's Comments

10. Page ii - Update 1st sentence in last paragraph to show that the project application was submitted by the City, not the County.

Response: This comment is noted. We will update the report accordingly.
11. Page 13 - Verify crash info and \# for the noted pedestrian/bicycle crash. The crash report seems to indicate the crash involved a southbound vehicle on Nova that struck a cyclist that was crossing diagonally (NE to SW), not an eastbound vehicle on Madeline.

Response: This comment is noted. We will verify the crash description and update the report accordingly.
12. Page 29-30 - Clarify which proposed modifications are included in the B/C and project cost estimates. It appears that the signal-related modifications are not included in the cost estimates, but the report combines the signal work and turn lanes in the recommendations. The assumption is that the intent is to implement the signal work together with the turn lane work as part of a single project, but it may be helpful to confirm this and update any language/cost estimates in the study as needed, particularly if any of the signal modifications could potentially require the mast arms to be rebuilt.

Response: This comment is noted. To clarify, FDOT may be implementing the signal modifications related to changing the permissive left turn phase to protected-only before the construction of the turn lane improvements. As suggested, we will update the LRE to include the cost of all the recommended signal-related modifications and the $B / C$ calculation.

## Responses to FDOT's Comments

13. Include left turn phasing warrants (NCHRP Report 457) in the analysis. Include specific recommendation to install now if left turn phasing is warranted.
a. Based on the above recommendation, address FYA by time of day and ped-omit phase for the permissive left turn movement during pedestrian actuation.
14. FPID 436325-2 includes ITS communication system and safety improvements at various intersections along SR 5A. The project was scheduled to begin in the Spring of 2021 and end in the Fall of 2022.
15. FPID 439881-1 is an intersection lighting project along SR 5A. SR 5A at Madeline Avenue is included in this project. The goal of this project is to increase pedestrian safety with improved lighting.
16. Short-term Improvements
a. Install flexible retroreflective backplates for all signal heads.
b. Install ADA-compliant detectable warnings on pedestrian ramps.
c. Install FTP-68B-06 sign panels to replace sign stickers at pedestrian pushbuttons.
d. Install post-mounted R10-15L Left-Turn Yield to Pedestrians signing on the eastbound and westbound approaches
e. Refresh yellow median nose painting and install RPMs
f. Add guide striping for all four left-turn movements
17. Long-Term Considerations
a. Install pedestrian detector stations with new pushbuttons to meet ADA criteria for the:
i. West leg at the NW and SW corners
ii. East leg at the NE and SW corners
iii. North leg in both directions in the median
iv. South leg at the SE corner
b. Reconstruct the traffic signal to meet current standards
c. Install intersection lighting to meet horizontal and vertical illuminance criteria per current FDOT standards as mandated when reconstructing a signalized intersection.

Responses for Comments 13 through 17: These comments are noted. We will update the report accordingly.

APPENDIX A-2:
Traffic Data

## Roadway Count Summary <br> Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Start Date : December 7, 2021
Stop Date : December 7, 2021
County : Volusia
Location : Madeline Ave at west of Nova Rd

| Start Time | 00:00 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Stop Time | $24: 00$ |
| Station Number | 0 |
| Equipment ID | 322 |

7-Dec-21

| End Time | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 13 | 54 | 61 | 63 | 63 | 61 |
| 30 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 27 | 73 | 88 | 65 | 63 | 70 |
| 45 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 21 | 76 | 66 | 73 | 63 | 84 |
| 00 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 14 | 54 | 78 | 78 | 67 | 63 | 83 |
| Hr Total | 20 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 50 | 115 | 281 | 293 | 268 | 252 | 298 |


| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 83 | 73 | 78 | 88 | 83 | 85 | 67 | 56 | 47 | 23 | 18 | 9 |
| 30 | 89 | 74 | 67 | 96 | 78 | 76 | 65 | 37 | 33 | 19 | 14 | 5 |
| 45 | 60 | 70 | 81 | 95 | 95 | 83 | 61 | 46 | 35 | 16 | 13 | 8 |
| 00 | 86 | 88 | 77 | 109 | 90 | 64 | 53 | 38 | 27 | 13 | 12 | 5 |
| Hr Total | 318 | 305 | 303 | 388 | 346 | 308 | 246 | 177 | 142 | 71 | 57 | 27 |


| 24 Hour Total | $:$ | 4,294 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | $11: 30$ | AM Peak Volume | $:$ | 339 | AM Peak Hour Factor | $:$ |
| PM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | $15: 00$ | PM Peak Volume | $:$ | 388 | PM PeaK Hour Factor | $:$ |

7-Dec-21

| End Time | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 12 | 19 | 42 | 90 | 67 | 76 | 69 |
| 30 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 15 | 21 | 53 | 63 | 66 | 72 | 54 |
| 45 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 38 | 73 | 64 | 65 | 59 | 61 |
| 00 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 44 | 87 | 54 | 58 | 62 | 70 |
| Hr Total | 20 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 16 | 51 | 122 | 255 | 271 | 256 | 269 | 254 |


| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 83 | 82 | 82 | 67 | 99 | 110 | 93 | 55 | 31 | 36 | 20 | 13 |
| 30 | 83 | 89 | 97 | 104 | 107 | 127 | 66 | 44 | 42 | 16 | 15 | 7 |
| 45 | 100 | 60 | 81 | 130 | 118 | 71 | 50 | 31 | 42 | 26 | 10 | 10 |
| 00 | 77 | 68 | 109 | 93 | 117 | 69 | 42 | 37 | 22 | 24 | 8 | 4 |
| Hr Total | 343 | 299 | 369 | 394 | 441 | 377 | 251 | 167 | 137 | 102 | 53 | 34 |



| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 166 | 155 | 160 | 155 | 182 | 195 | 160 | 111 | 78 | 59 | 38 | 22 |
| 30 | 172 | 163 | 164 | 200 | 185 | 203 | 131 | 81 | 75 | 35 | 29 | 12 |
| 45 | 160 | 130 | 162 | 225 | 213 | 154 | 111 | 77 | 77 | 42 | 23 | 18 |
| 00 | 163 | 156 | 186 | 202 | 207 | 133 | 95 | 75 | 49 | 37 | 20 | 9 |
| Hr Total | 661 | 604 | 672 | 782 | 787 | 685 | 497 | 344 | 279 | 173 | 110 | 61 |


|  | AM Peak Volume | $:$ | 651 | AM Peak Hour Factor | $: 0.95$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | $16: 30$ | PM Peak Volume | $: 818$ | PM PeaK Hour Factor |

## Roadway Count Summary <br> Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc.

Start Date : December 7, 2021
Stop Date : December 7, 2021
County : Volusia
Location : Nova Rd south of Madeline Ave

| Start Time | $00: 00$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Stop Time | $24: 00$ |
| Station Number | 0 |
| Equipment ID | 9 |

7-Dec-21

| End Time | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 23 | 17 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 27 | 71 | 145 | 218 | 209 | 212 | 244 |
| 30 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 34 | 64 | 216 | 208 | 221 | 237 | 217 |
| 45 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 21 | 37 | 135 | 302 | 243 | 245 | 256 |
| 206 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 22 | 54 | 141 | 309 | 221 | 230 | 246 | 260 |
| Hr Total | 65 | 44 | 32 | 28 | 70 | 152 | 411 | 972 | 890 | 905 | 951 | 927 |


| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 262 | 261 | 240 | 251 | 296 | 309 | 223 | 163 | 112 | 92 | 62 | 44 |
| 30 | 222 | 240 | 285 | 257 | 287 | 265 | 242 | 111 | 111 | 62 | 45 | 36 |
| 45 | 262 | 283 | 271 | 271 | 294 | 262 | 192 | 132 | 82 | 62 | 48 | 32 |
| 00 | 231 | 267 | 247 | 280 | 291 | 242 | 139 | 122 | 96 | 65 | 30 | 22 |
| Hr Total | 977 | 1,051 | 1,043 | 1,059 | 1,168 | 1,078 | 796 | 528 | 401 | 281 | 185 | 134 |


| 24 Hour Total | $:$ | 14,148 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| AM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | $7: 15$ | AM Peak Volume | $:$ | 1,045 | AM Peak Hour Factor | $:$ |
| PM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | $16: 15$ | PM Peak Volume | $:$ | 1,181 | PM PeaK Hour Factor | $:$ |

## 7-Dec-21

Lane 2

| End Time | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |


| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 00 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hr Total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

24 Hour Total
AM Peak Hour begins
PM Peak Hour begins

0
. AM Peak Volume :

| AM Peak Volume | $:$ | 0 | AM Peak Hour Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| PM Peak Volume | $:$ | 0 | PM PeaK Hour Factor |

PM PeaK Hour Factor
7-Dec-21

| End Time | 00 | 01 | 02 | 03 | 04 | 05 | 06 | 07 | 08 | 09 | 10 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 23 | 17 | 10 | 11 | 7 | 27 | 71 | 145 | 218 | 209 | 212 | 244 |
| 30 | 20 | 12 | 5 | 7 | 20 | 34 | 64 | 216 | 208 | 221 | 237 | 217 |
| 45 | 12 | 5 | 8 | 6 | 21 | 37 | 135 | 302 | 243 | 245 | 256 | 206 |
| 00 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 4 | 22 | 54 | 141 | 309 | 221 | 230 | 246 | 260 |
| Hr Total | 65 | 44 | 32 | 28 | 70 | 152 | 411 | 972 | 890 | 905 | 951 | 927 |


| End Time | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 262 | 261 | 240 | 251 | 296 | 309 | 223 | 163 | 112 | 92 | 62 | 44 |
| 30 | 222 | 240 | 285 | 257 | 287 | 265 | 242 | 111 | 111 | 62 | 45 | 36 |
| 45 | 262 | 283 | 271 | 271 | 294 | 262 | 192 | 132 | 82 | 62 | 48 | 32 |
| 00 | 231 | 267 | 247 | 280 | 291 | 242 | 139 | 122 | 96 | 65 | 30 | 22 |
| Hr Total | 977 | 1,051 | 1,043 | 1,059 | 1,168 | 1,078 | 796 | 528 | 401 | 281 | 185 | 134 |


| PM Peak Hour begins | $:$ | AM Peak Volume | $: 1,045$ | AM Peak Hour Factor |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |



FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
SUMMARY OF VEHICLE MOVEMENTS


| Percentage | 1.6\% | 11.5\% | 83.3\% | 3.3\% | 0.3\% | 100.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.2\% | 84.8\% | 7.9\% | 2.2\% | 100.0\% | N/A | 0.2\% | 25.1\% | 30.9\% | 34.2\% | 9.6\% | 100.0\% | 0.1\% | 20.5\% | 51.1\% | 23.3\% | 5.0\% | 100.0\% | N/A |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Maximum | 19 | 179 | 937 | 44 | 6 | 1,184 | 34 | 51 | 1,228 | 135 | 35 | 1,416 | 2,457 | 3 | 105 | 131 | 164 | 42 | 393 | 1 | 50 | 125 | 77 | 18 | 268 | 581 |
| Minimum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Heavy Veh | 23 |  | 199 | 10 | 1 | 233 | 2.0\% |  | 249 | 16 | 6 | 280 | 513 | 2.5\% |  | 22 | 22 | 3 | 64 |  |  | 17 | 4 | 0 | 30 | 94 |
| \% Heavy Veh |  |  | 3.0\% | 3.8\% |  | 2.9\% |  |  | 3.3\% | 2.5\% |  | 3.2\% | 3.1\% |  |  | 2.7\% | 2.2\% |  | 2.4\% | 2.9\% |  | 2.2\% | 0.9\% |  | 2.0\% | 2.3\% |




## APPENDIX B:

## Existing Synchro Outputs And <br> Signal Timing Sheets And Left Turn Phase Warrants



|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 34.0 | 34.1 | 121.9 | 122.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 104 | 48 | 54 | 100 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 88 | 27 | 143 | 113 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.39 | 2.22 | 3.29 | 3.36 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | B | B | C | C |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh//h) | 363 | 334 | 1360 | 1138 |
| Efft. Green for Bike $(\mathrm{s})$ | 35.0 | 35.0 | 84.0 | 75.9 |
| Cross Street Width (ft) | 121.9 | 122.0 | 34.1 | 34.0 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 467 | 467 | 1120 | 1012 |
| Bicycle Delay (sl/bike) | 44.1 | 44.1 | 14.5 | 18.3 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.59 | 3.55 | 1.76 | 1.63 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | D | B | B |



Splits and Phases: 3: Nova Rd \& Madeline Ave



Splits and Phases: 3: Nova Rd \& Madeline Ave


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 34.0 | 34.1 | 121.9 | 122.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 192 | 70 | 52 | 86 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 145 | 54 | 164 | 52 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Area per Ped (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | 2.57 | 2.26 | 3.35 | 3.38 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | C | B | C | C |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS |  |  |  |  |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh//h) | 416 | 222 | 1264 | 1573 |
| Efft. Green for Bike $(\mathrm{s})$ | 34.4 | 34.4 | 89.7 | 79.9 |
| Cross Street Width (ft) | 121.9 | 122.0 | 34.1 | 34.0 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 430 | 430 | 1121 | 999 |
| Bicycle Delay (sl/bike) | 49.3 | 49.3 | 15.4 | 20.1 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.68 | 3.36 | 1.70 | 1.87 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | C | B | B |




APPENDIX C: Crash Data

Crash Data Summary - Madeline Ave at S Nova Road

| No. | Crash ID | Date | Day | Time | Hour | Year | Crash Type | Crash Severity | Fatalities | Injuries | Property Damage | Day/Night | Wet/Dry | Alcohol Related | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Drug } \\ \text { Related } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 89398399 | 3/11/2021 | Thursday | 12:10 PM | 12 | 2021 | Angle | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | $N$ | N |
| 2 | 24033118 | 4/2/2021 | Friday | 4:25 PM | 16 | 2021 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 3 | 87119106 | 11/21/2017 | Tuesday | 1:25 AM | 01 | 2017 | Angle | Injury | 0 | 3 | \$3,000 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 4 | 87740124 | 8/25/2019 | Sunday | 3:50 PM | 15 | 2019 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 5 | 87510020 | 9/15/2018 | Saturday | 10:14 AM | 10 | 2018 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 6 | 86396450 | 5/25/2018 | Friday | 6:58 PM | 18 | 2018 | Off Road | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 7 | 87740743 | 11/27/2019 | Wednesday | 7:13 AM | 07 | 2019 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 8 | 85812774 | 2/3/2016 | Wednesday | 4:35 PM | 16 | 2016 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 9 | 87740387 | 12/2/2019 | Monday | 5:12 PM | 17 | 2019 | Off Road | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 10 | 85813453 | 7/18/2016 | Monday | 12:34 PM | 12 | 2016 | Rear End | No injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 11 | 86396149 | 1/12/2017 | Thursday | 7:19 AM | 07 | 2017 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 12 | 87738917 | 1/13/2019 | Sunday | 2:02 PM | 14 | 2019 | Angle | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 13 | 87740504 | 12/23/2019 | Monday | 4:06 PM | 16 | 2019 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 14 | 87510617 | 1/4/2019 | Friday | 7:00 PM | 19 | 2019 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Wet | N | N |
| 15 | 24032702 | 1/16/2021 | Saturday | 9:20 AM | 09 | 2021 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 16 | 87740275 | 9/20/2019 | Friday | 3:35 PM | 15 | 2019 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 17 | 87739715 | 6/30/2019 | Sunday | 11:45 PM | 23 | 2019 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 18 | 87739595 | 3/27/2019 | Wednesday | 7:48 PM | 19 | 2019 | Left Turn | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Wet | N | N |
| 19 | 87510338 | 10/6/2018 | Saturday | 11:40 PM | 23 | 2018 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | $N$ | N |
| 20 | 87510318 | 3/11/2018 | Sunday | 9:19 PM | 21 | 2018 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 21 | 87509976 | 8/19/2018 | Sunday | 2:37 PM | 14 | 2018 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 22 | 87739517 | 11/4/2019 | Monday | 6:34 PM | 18 | 2019 | Angle | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Wet | N | N |
| 23 | 86751680 | 4/19/2017 | Wednesday | 11:08 AM | 11 | 2017 | Angle | Serious Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 24 | 86751570 | 10/8/2017 | Sunday | 11:06 AM | 11 | 2017 | Angle | Serious Injury | 0 | 3 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 25 | 86396460 | 11/3/2017 | Friday | 5:44 PM | 17 | 2017 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 26 | 86396372 | 7/22/2017 | Saturday | 3:03 PM | 15 | 2017 | Left Turn | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Wet | N | N |
| 27 | 86396537 | 2/24/2017 | Friday | 9:50 AM | 09 | 2017 | Off Road | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 28 | 85813308 | 7/1/2016 | Friday | 2:31 AM | 02 | 2016 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | Y | $N$ |
| 29 | 8454190 | 1/28/2016 | Thursday | 1:50 AM | 01 | 2016 | Other | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Wet | N | $N$ |
| 30 | 85812450 | 3/6/2016 | Sunday | 6:37 PM | 18 | 2016 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 31 | 85812803 | 2/10/2016 | Wednesday | 1:53 PM | 13 | 2016 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 32 | 85813147 | 4/26/2016 | Tuesday | 9:32 AM | 09 | 2016 | Right Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 33 | 87509882 | 8/17/2018 | Friday | 1:10 PM | 13 | 2018 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 34 | 87510652 | 3/17/2019 | Sunday | 2:04 PM | 14 | 2019 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Wet | N | N |
| 35 | 87739184 | 2/1/2019 | Friday | 1:40 PM | 13 | 2019 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 36 | 86396485 | 12/30/2017 | Saturday | 7:45 PM | 19 | 2017 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 37 | 87509791 | 3/31/2018 | Saturday | 5:15 PM | 17 | 2018 | Rear End | Serious Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | Y | , |
| 38 | 87740730 | 11/11/2019 | Monday | 6:50 PM | 18 | 2019 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 39 | 86396511 | 2/27/2017 | Monday | 4:18 PM | 16 | 2017 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 40 | 87510381 | 8/29/2018 | Wednesday | 8:19 AM | 08 | 2018 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 41 | 87509716 | 11/16/2017 | Thursday | 3:27 PM | 15 | 2017 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 42 | 24033383 | 2/1/2021 | Monday | 3:41 PM | 15 | 2021 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 43 | 24032251 | 11/1/2020 | Sunday | 1:20 AM | 01 | 2020 | Rollover | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 44 | 24032492 | 8/13/2020 | Thursday | 9:09 AM | 09 | 2020 | Sideswipe | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 45 | 24032430 | 11/7/2020 | Saturday | 6:34 PM | 18 | 2020 | Off Road | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$1,000 | Dark - Not Lighted | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 46 | 24032474 | 8/8/2020 | Saturday | 12:01 AM | 00 | 2020 | Left Turn | Fatality | 1 | 2 | \$5,000 | Dark - Lighted | Wet | Y | Y |
| 47 | 24032824 | 11/17/2020 | Tuesday | 5:46 PM | 17 | 2020 | Left Turn | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dusk | Dry | N |  |
| 48 | 86751713 | 11/20/2017 | Monday | 6:10 PM | 18 | 2017 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dusk | Dry | N | N |
| 49 | 87738602 | 4/27/2019 | Saturday | 9:00 PM | 21 | 2019 | Other | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Dry | Y | N |
| 50 | 87739836 | 5/30/2019 | Thursday | 11:27 AM | 11 | 2019 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 51 | 89399168 | 10/20/2021 | Wednesday | 8:15 PM | 20 | 2021 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Dry | N |  |
| 52 | 89399323 | 12/1/2021 | Wednesday | 2:07 PM | 14 | 2021 | Right Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 53 | 89399146 | 10/13/2021 | Wednesday | 1:40 PM | 13 | 2021 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 54 | 89399087 | 9/29/2021 | Wednesday | 8:00 PM | 20 | 2021 | Left Turn | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 55 | 87741199 | 2/28/2020 | Friday | 11:10 AM | 11 | 2020 | Angle | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 56 | 87741294 | 5/26/2020 | Tuesday | 9:55 AM | 09 | 2020 | Angle | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Wet | N | N |
| 57 | 24032214 | 10/8/2020 | Thursday | 6:10 PM | 18 | 2020 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 58 | 24032575 | 10/27/2020 | Tuesday | 4:32 PM | 16 | 2020 | Sideswipe | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 59 | 24032062 | 10/5/2020 | Monday | 1:00 PM | 13 | 2020 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N |  |
| 60 | 89398566 | 5/4/2021 | Tuesday | 8:20 PM | 20 | 2021 | Left Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Wet | N | , |
| 61 | 89399051 | 9/17/2021 | Friday | 5:10 PM | 17 | 2021 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 62 | 24032490 | 8/25/2020 | Tuesday | 10:33 AM | 10 | 2020 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 63 | 89398881 | 8/4/2021 | Wednesday | 9:50 PM | 21 | 2021 | Right Turn | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Wet | Y | $N$ |
| 64 | 24032113 | 8/3/2020 | Monday | 5:44 AM | 05 | 2020 | Off Road | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$300 | Dark-Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 65 | 86752386 | 4/11/2018 | Wednesday | 7:55 PM | 19 | 2018 | Left Turn | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Dark-Lighted | Dry | N |  |
| 66 | 24032094 | 6/3/2020 | Wednesday | 4:21 PM | 16 | 2020 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |

Crash Data Summary - Madeline Ave at S Nova Road

| No. | Crash ID | Date | Day | Time | Hour | Year | Crash Type | Crash Severity | Fatalities | Injuries | Property Damage | Day/Night | Wet/Dry | Alcohol Related | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Drug } \\ \text { Related } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67 | 87740785 | 12/6/2019 | Friday | 3:43 PM | 15 | 2019 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | $N$ |
| 68 | 89398892 | 8/6/2021 | Friday | 1:11 PM | 13 | 2021 | Bicycle | Serious Injury | 0 | 1 | \$250 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 69 | 24032246 | 8/22/2020 | Saturday | 10:00 AM | 10 | 2020 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 1 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |
| 70 | 87741290 | 3/7/2020 | Saturday | 8:43 PM | 20 | 2020 | Rear End | No Injury | 0 | 0 | \$0 | Dark - Lighted | Dry | N | N |
| 71 | 89398655 | 5/31/2021 | Monday | 10:05 AM | 10 | 2021 | Rear End | Injury | 0 | 2 | \$0 | Daylight | Dry | N | N |

APPENDIX D:
Future Traffic Development

Traffic Trends - V03.a
NOVA RD (NEW) -- Madeline Ave to Big Tree


| County: | Volusia (79) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 363 |
| Highway: | NOVA RD (NEW) |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 36 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $1.14 \%$ |  |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $0.11 \%$ |  |
|  | Trend Growth Rate (2019 to Design Year): | $0.14 \%$ |
| Printed: | 21-Jan-22 |  |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |  |


| Year | Traffic (ADT/AADT) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count* | Trend** |
| 2009 | 27500 | 26900 |
| 2010 | 28500 | 26900 |
| 2011 | 27000 | 26900 |
| 2012 | 25500 | 27000 |
| 2013 | 26500 | 27000 |
| 2014 | 26500 | 27000 |
| 2015 | 26500 | 27100 |
| 2016 | 27000 | 27100 |
| 2017 | 26000 | 27200 |
| 2018 | 27000 | 27200 |
| 2019 | 29500 | 27200 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2025 Opening Year Trend |  |  |
| 2025 | N/A | 27400 |
| 2035 Mid-Year Trend |  |  |
| 2035 | N/A | 27800 |
| 2045 Design Year Trend |  |  |
| 2045 | N/A | 28200 |
| TRANPLAN Forecasts/Trends |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Axle-Adjusted

Traffic Trends - V03.a
NOVA RD (NEW) -- SR 421 to Madeline Ave

| FIN\# | 1234 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Location | 1 |


| County: | Volusia (79) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Station \#: | 1017 |
| Highway: | NOVA RD (NEW) |



| ${ }^{* *}$ Annual Trend Increase: | 86 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Trend R-squared: | $17.52 \%$ |
| Trend Annual Historic Growth Rate: | $0.34 \%$ |
| Trend Growth Rate (2019 to Design Year): | $0.33 \%$ |
| Printed: | $21-$ Jan-22 |
| Straight Line Growth Option |  |


| Year | Traffic (ADT/AADT) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Count* | Trend** |
| 2009 | 26500 | 26300 |
| 2010 | 27000 | 26400 |
| 2011 | 26500 | 26500 |
| 2012 | 25500 | 26600 |
| 2013 | 26000 | 26700 |
| 2014 | 27000 | 26800 |
| 2015 | 28000 | 26900 |
| 2016 | 26500 | 26900 |
| 2017 | 27500 | 27000 |
| 2018 | 27000 | 27100 |
| 2019 | 27000 | 27200 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 2025 Opening Year Trend |  |  |
| 2025 | N/A | 27700 |
| 2035 Mid-Year Trend |  |  |
| 2035 | N/A | 28600 |
| 2045 Design Year Trend |  |  |
| 2045 | N/A | 29500 |
| TRANPLAN Forecasts/Trends |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Axle-Adjusted

# Projections of Florida Population by County, 2025-2045, with Estimates for 2020 

Stefan Rayer, Population Program Director<br>Ying Wang, Research Demographer

The Bureau of Economic and Business Research (BEBR) has been making population projections for Florida and its counties since the 1970s. This report presents our most recent set of projections and describes the methodology used to construct those projections. To account for uncertainty regarding future population growth, we publish three series of projections. We believe the medium series is the most likely to provide accurate forecasts in most circumstances, but the low and high series provide an indication of the uncertainty surrounding the medium series. It should be noted that these projections refer solely to permanent residents of Florida; they do not include tourists or seasonal residents. Furthermore, we note that this set of projections is still based on the Census 2010 counts and the BEBR population estimates since then. The next set of BEBR county projections, scheduled for release in early 2022, will incorporate the Census 2020 counts.

## State projections

The starting point for the state-level projections was the April 1, 2010 census population count by age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin, as adjusted by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) in the Vintage 2017 bridged race population estimates. Projections were made in one-year intervals using a cohortcomponent methodology in which births, deaths, and migration are projected separately for each agesex cohort in Florida for non-Hispanic whites, nonHispanic nonwhites, and Hispanics. We applied three
different sets of assumptions to provide low, medium, and high series of projections. Although the low and high series do not provide absolute bounds on future population change, they provide a reasonable range in which Florida's future population is likely to fall.

Survival rates were applied by single year of age, sex, race, and Hispanic origin to project future deaths in the population. These rates were based on Florida Life Tables for 2012-2018, using mortality data published by the Office of Vital Statistics in the Florida Department of Health. The survival rates were adjusted upward each year until 2044 to account for projected increases in life expectancy. These adjustments were based on projected increases in survival rates released by the U.S. Census Bureau. We used the same mortality assumptions for all three series of projections because there is less uncertainty regarding future changes in mortality rates than is true for migration and fertility rates.

Domestic migration rates by age and sex were based on Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) files from the 2010-2019 American Community Survey (ACS) 1year estimates, and the 2014-2018 and 2015-2019 ACS 5-year estimates. We first calculated an average of the 2010-2018 1-year estimates and the 20142018 5-year estimates. Next, we calculated an average of the 2011-2019 1-year estimates and the 2015-2019 5-year estimates. Our final domestic migration rates were based on an average of these two

Projections of Florida Population by County, 2025-2045, with Estimates for 2020 (continued)

| County | Estimates |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| and State | April 1, 2020 | 2025 | 2030 | 2035 | 2040 | 2045 |
| SANTA ROSA | 184,653 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 182,000 | 187,800 | 191,600 | 194,400 | 195,700 |
| Medium |  | 201,800 | 215,900 | 227,800 | 238,700 | 248,500 |
| High |  | 220,200 | 244,000 | 267,100 | 290,100 | 313,300 |
| SARASOTA | 438,816 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 432,900 | 442,400 | 449,000 | 453,100 | 454,900 |
| Medium |  | 472,100 | 498,200 | 520,400 | 539,900 | 557,500 |
| High |  | 507,100 | 549,800 | 588,600 | 625,900 | 661,900 |
| SEMINOLE | 476,727 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 471,200 | 480,600 | 487,500 | 491,400 | 492,200 |
| Medium |  | 505,100 | 528,500 | 548,400 | 565,100 | 579,400 |
| High |  | 537,900 | 578,400 | 614,700 | 648,100 | 678,300 |
| SUMTER | 141,422 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 148,800 | 162,100 | 171,400 | 178,000 | 182,100 |
| Medium |  | 167,800 | 190,000 | 208,200 | 223,800 | 237,900 |
| High |  | 185,000 | 218,000 | 249,600 | 280,000 | 310,600 |
| SUWANNEE | 45,463 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 44,100 | 44,400 | 44,400 | 44,200 | 43,900 |
| Medium |  | 47,200 | 48,700 | 49,900 | 50,800 | 51,700 |
| High |  | 50,600 | 53,800 | 56,800 | 59,400 | 62,000 |
| TAYLOR | 22,436 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 20,900 | 20,400 | 19,900 | 19,300 | 18,600 |
| Medium |  | 22,800 | 23,000 | 23,100 | 23,200 | 23,300 |
| High |  | 24,700 | 25,800 | 26,800 | 27,700 | 28,600 |
| UNION | 15,410 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 14,300 | 14,000 | 13,500 | 13,100 | 12,600 |
| Medium |  | 15,600 | 15,700 | 15,800 | 15,800 | 15,800 |
| High |  | 16,900 | 17,600 | 18,300 | 18,800 | 19,300 |
| VOLUSIA | 551,588 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 544,700 | 553,500 | 558,000 | 560,500 | 561,900 |
| Medium |  | 583,900 | 608,900 | 628,800 | 646,100 | 662,000 |
| High |  | 621,800 | 666,200 | 703,500 | 739,300 | 774,300 |
| WAKULLA | 33,981 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 33,400 | 34,200 | 34,700 | 34,800 | 34,700 |
| Medium |  | 36,400 | 38,400 | 40,100 | 41,400 | 42,600 |
| High |  | 39,300 | 42,900 | 46,400 | 49,400 | 52,300 |
| WALTON | 74,724 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 76,100 | 81,300 | 85,000 | 87,900 | 90,200 |
| Medium |  | 85,900 | 95,500 | 103,600 | 110,900 | 117,900 |
| High |  | 94,600 | 109,300 | 123,800 | 138,300 | 153,900 |
| WASHINGTON | 25,334 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 24,100 | 23,900 | 23,600 | 23,200 | 22,700 |
| Medium |  | 26,200 | 26,800 | 27,300 | 27,700 | 28,100 |
| High |  | 28,400 | 30,200 | 31,800 | 33,300 | 34,800 |
| FLORIDA | 21,596,068 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low |  | 22,164,100 | 23,037,100 | 23,650,600 | 24,090,900 | 24,405,600 |
| Medium |  | 23,138,600 | 24,419,100 | 25,461,900 | 26,356,400 | 27,149,800 |
| High |  | 24,109,200 | 25,798,900 | 27,275,900 | 28,634,200 | 29,921,300 |


| UNIVERSITY of HDOBTDA | Bureau of Economic and Business Research College of Liberal Arts and Sciences 720 SW $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue, Suite 150, P.O. Box 117148 Gainesville, Florida 32611-7148 | Phone (352) 392-0171 <br> www.bebr.ufl.edu |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |

Future Land Use and Zoning - Northeast and Southeast Quadrants


3401 Nova Rd.
Acreage: +/- 15.5 acres
FLU: Commercial (FAR 0.5)
Zoning: PCD without an MDA
Estimated Buildable Sq.ft. $=270,000$


950 Madeline Ave.
Acreage: +/- 8.11 acres FLU: Commercial (FAR 0.5)
Zoning: R-3M (12 units/acre)

Estimated Buildable Sq.ft. $=141,300$

ITE Trip Generation Manual Vested Trips Calculation - AM Peak Hour

| Query Filer |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| DATA SOURCE: |  |
| Trip Generation Manual, 11th Ed | $\checkmark$ |
| SEARCH BY LAND USE CODE: |  |
| 821 Q |  |
| LAND USE GROUP: |  |
| (800-899) Retail | $\checkmark$ |
| LAND USE: |  |
| 821 - Shopping Plaza (40-150k) | $\checkmark$ |
| LAND USE SUBCATEGORY: |  |
| Supermarket - Yes | $\checkmark$ |
| SEtting_location: |  |
| General Urban/Suburban | $\checkmark$ |
| INDEPENDENT VARIABLE (IV): |  |
| 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA | $\checkmark$ |
| time Period: |  |
| Weekday, Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic $\checkmark$ |  |
| TRIP TYPE: |  |
| Vehicle | $\checkmark$ |
| ENTER IV VALUE TO CALCULATE TRIPS: |  |
| 67.5 Calculate |  |




ITE Trip Generation Manual Vested Trips Calculation - PM Peak Hour



| DATA STATISTICS |
| :---: |
| Land Use: <br> Shopping Plaza ( $40-150 \mathrm{k}$ ) - Supermarket - Yes ( 82 Click for Description and Dala Plots |
| Independent Variable: <br> 1000 Sq. Ft GLA |
| Time Period: <br> Weekday <br> Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic <br> One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m |
| Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban |
| Trip Type: Vehicle |
| Number of Studies: $51$ |
| Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 87 |
| Average Rate 9.03 |
| Range of Rates: $5.35-16.45$ |
| Standard Deviation: $2.37$ |
| Fitted Curve Equation: $T=7.67(X)+118.86$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & R^{2} \\ & 0.62 \end{aligned}$ |
| Directional Distribution: $48 \%$ entering, $52 \%$ exiting |
| Calculated Trip Ends: <br> Average Rate: 610 (Total), 293 (Entry), 317 (Exit) Fitted Curve: 637 (Total), 306 (Entry), 331 (Exit) |
| DATA STATISTICS |
| Land Use: <br> Strip Retail Plaza ( $<40 \mathrm{k}$ ) ( 822 ) Click for Description and Data Plots |
| Independent Variable: 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA |
| Time Period: <br> Weekday <br> Peak Hour of Adjacent Street Traffic <br> One Hour Between 4 and 6 p.m. |
| Setting/Location: General Urban/Suburban |
| Trip Type: Vehicle |
| Number of Studies: $25$ |
| Avg. 1000 Sq. Ft. GLA: 21 |
| Average Rate: $6.59$ |
| Range of Rates $2.81-15.20$ |
| Standard Deviation: $2.94$ |
| Fitted Curve Equation: $\operatorname{Ln}(T)=0.71 \operatorname{Ln}(X)+2.72$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{R}^{2} \\ & 0.56 \end{aligned}$ |
| Directional Distribution: $50 \%$ entering. $50 \%$ exiting |
| Calculated Trip Ends: <br> Average Rate: 234 (Total), 117 (Entry), 117 (Exit) Fitted Curve: 191 (Total), 95 (Entry), 96 (Exit) |

FUTURE TURNING MOVEMENT COUNT CALCULATION - BACKGROUND PLUS POTENTIAL VESTED TRIPS

| Study Intersection |  | 2021 AM | 2025 Background |  | Project Trips | Total 2025 AM | 2021 PM | 2025 Ba | ckground | Project Trips | Total 2025 PM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth | 2025 AM | Growth |  |  |  | 2025 PM |  |  |
| Madeline Avenue | EBL |  | 100 | 1\% | 104 | 8 | 112 | 86 | 1\% | 89 | 16 | 105 |
|  | EBT | 84 | 1\% | 87 | 26 | 113 | 161 | 1\% | 167 | 58 | 225 |
|  | EBR | 143 | 1\% | 149 |  | 149 | 164 | 1\% | 171 |  | 171 |
|  | WBL | 54 | 1\% | 56 | 6 | 62 | 52 | 1\% | 54 | 25 | 79 |
|  | WBT | 133 | 1\% | 138 | 14 | 152 | 115 | 1\% | 120 | 57 | 177 |
|  | WBR | 113 | 1\% | 118 | 12 | 130 | 52 | 1\% | 54 | 26 | 80 |
| Nova Road | NBL | 104 | 1\% | 108 | 5 | 113 | 192 | 1\% | 200 | 10 | 210 |
|  | NBT | 1,093 | 1\% | 1,137 | 122 | 1,259 | 1,005 | 1\% | 1,045 | 282 | 1,327 |
|  | NBR | 27 | 1\% | 28 | 8 | 36 | 54 | 1\% | 56 | 19 | 75 |
|  | SBL | 48 | 1\% | 50 | 16 | 66 | 70 | 1\% | 73 | 25 | 98 |
|  | SBT | 888 | 1\% | 924 |  | 924 | 1,342 | 1\% | 1,396 |  | 1,396 |
|  | SBR | 88 | 1\% | 92 |  | 92 | 145 | 1\% | 151 |  | 151 |

## APPENDIX E:

2025 Synchro Analysis Outputs

|  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ |  |  | 7 |  |  | 4 | $\uparrow$ | $p$ |  | $\downarrow$ | $\downarrow$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\hat{1}$ |  | \％ | $\hat{F}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 惺家 |  | \％ | 惺施 |  |
| Trafic Volume（vph） | 112 | 113 | 149 | 62 | 152 | 130 | 113 | 1259 | 36 | 66 | 924 | 92 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 112 | 113 | 149 | 62 | 152 | 130 | 113 | 1259 | 36 | 66 | 924 | 92 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1728 | 1673 | 0 | 1745 | 1676 | 0 | 1805 | 5068 | 0 | 1805 | 4974 | 0 |
| Flt Permitted | 0.269 |  |  | 0.312 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 489 | 1673 | 0 | 573 | 1676 | 0 | 1805 | 5068 | 0 | 1805 | 4974 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 47 |  |  | 30 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 13 |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 124 | 292 | 0 | 69 | 313 | 0 | 126 | 1439 | 0 | 73 | 1129 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 57.0 | 57.0 |  | 57.0 | 57.0 |  | 30.0 | 69.0 |  | 24.0 | 63.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 11.5 | 8.5 |  | 11.5 | 8.5 |  | 8.6 | 7.1 |  | 8.6 | 7.1 |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 30.4 | 33.4 |  | 30.4 | 33.4 |  | 15.7 | 81.0 |  | 11.4 | 76.7 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.20 | 0.22 |  | 0.20 | 0.22 |  | 0.10 | 0.54 |  | 0.08 | 0.51 |  |
| $\mathrm{v} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 1.25 | 0.72 |  | 0.60 | 0.79 |  | 0.67 | 0.53 |  | 0.53 | 0.44 |  |
| Control Delay | 221.7 | 53.9 |  | 73.3 | 63.3 |  | 81.1 | 24.7 |  | 80.1 | 25.4 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 221.7 | 53.9 |  | 73.3 | 63.3 |  | 81.1 | 24.7 |  | 80.1 | 25.4 |  |
| LOS | F | D |  | E | E |  | F | C |  | F | C |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 103.9 |  |  | 65.1 |  |  | 29.3 |  |  | 28.8 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | F |  |  | E |  |  | C |  |  | C |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset： 85 （ $57 \%$ ），Referenced to phase 2：SBT and 6：NBT，Start of Yellow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Actuated－Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 1.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 41.6 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 85．8\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis Period（min） 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Splits and Phases：3：Nova Rd \＆Madeline Ave


Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Defay (hr) | 37 |
| Stops (\#) | 2007 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 12 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 50 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 587 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 77 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.7 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 90 |
| Performance Index | 43.3 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 34.0 | 34.1 | 121.9 | 122.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 113 | 66 | 62 | 112 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 92 | 36 | 149 | 130 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corne Area per Ped (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | 2.43 | 2.29 | 3.36 | 3.44 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS | B | B | C | C |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh/h) | 416 | 382 | 1565 | 1202 |
| Effct. Green for Bike (s) | 33.4 | 33.4 | 81.0 | 76.7 |
| Cross Street Width (ft) | 121.9 | 122.0 | 34.1 | 34.0 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 445 | 445 | 1080 | 1023 |
| Bicycle Delay (s/bike) | 45.3 | 45.3 | 15.9 | 17.9 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.68 | 3.63 | 1.87 | 1.67 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | D | B | B |


|  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\uparrow$ |  |  | $\downarrow$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lane Group | EBL | EBT | EBR | WBL | WBT | WBR | NBL | NBT | NBR | SBL | SBT | SBR |
| Lane Configurations | \％ | $\hat{1}$ |  | \％ | $\hat{1}$ |  | ${ }^{7}$ | 㙟 |  | 7 | 惺家 |  |
| Traffic Volume（vph） | 105 | 225 | 171 | 79 | 177 | 80 | 210 | 1327 | 75 | 98 | 1396 | 151 |
| Future Volume（vph） | 105 | 225 | 171 | 79 | 177 | 80 | 210 | 1327 | 75 | 98 | 1396 | 151 |
| Satd．Flow（prot） | 1662 | 1703 | 0 | 1745 | 1716 | 0 | 1787 | 5050 | 0 | 1787 | 5054 | 0 |
| FIt Permitted | 0.411 |  |  | 0.165 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  | 0.950 |  |  |
| Satd．Flow（perm） | 719 | 1703 | 0 | 303 | 1716 | 0 | 1787 | 5050 | 0 | 1787 | 5054 | 0 |
| Satd．Flow（RTOR） |  | 24 |  |  | 14 |  |  | 7 |  |  | 14 |  |
| Lane Group Flow（vph） | 106 | 400 | 0 | 80 | 260 | 0 | 212 | 1416 | 0 | 99 | 1563 | 0 |
| Turn Type | Perm | NA |  | Perm | NA |  | Prot | NA |  | Prot | NA |  |
| Protected Phases |  | 8 |  |  | 4 |  | 1 | 6 |  | 5 | 2 |  |
| Permitted Phases | 8 |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Split（s） | 53.0 | 53.0 |  | 53.0 | 53.0 |  | 36.0 | 81.8 |  | 25.2 | 71.0 |  |
| Total Lost Time（s） | 11.5 | 8.5 |  | 11.5 | 8.5 |  | 8.6 | 7.1 |  | 8.6 | 7.1 |  |
| Act Effct Green（s） | 37.4 | 40.4 |  | 37.4 | 40.4 |  | 23.2 | 81.8 |  | 13.6 | 72.2 |  |
| Actuated g／C Ratio | 0.23 | 0.25 |  | 0.23 | 0.25 |  | 0.14 | 0.51 |  | 0.08 | 0.45 |  |
| $\mathrm{V} / \mathrm{c}$ Ratio | 0.63 | 0.89 |  | 1.14 | 0.59 |  | 0.82 | 0.55 |  | 0.65 | 0.68 |  |
| Control Delay | 71.8 | 76.5 |  | 202.5 | 54.6 |  | 90.1 | 28.4 |  | 90.3 | 37.8 |  |
| Queue Delay | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  | 0.0 | 0.0 |  |
| Total Delay | 71.8 | 76.5 |  | 202.5 | 54.6 |  | 90.1 | 28.4 |  | 90.3 | 37.8 |  |
| LOS | E | E |  | F | D |  | F | C |  | F | D |  |
| Approach Delay |  | 75.5 |  |  | 89.4 |  |  | 36.4 |  |  | 40.9 |  |
| Approach LOS |  | E |  |  | F |  |  | D |  |  | D |  |
| Intersection Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cycle Length： 160 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Actuated Cycle Length： 160 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Offset： 153 （96\％），Referenced to phase 2：SBT and 6：NBT，Start of Yellow |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Control Type：Actuated－Coordinated |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Maximum v／c Ratio： 1.14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Signal Delay： 47.4 |  |  |  | Intersection LOS：D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Intersection Capacity Utilization 103．2\％ |  |  |  | ICU Level of Service G |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Analysis Period（min） 15
Splits and Phases：3：Nova Rd \＆Madeline Ave


Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Delay (hr) | 54 |
| Stops (\#) | 3149 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 11 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 70 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 758 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 108 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.0 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 1 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 109 |
| Performance Index | 62.6 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 34.0 | 34.1 | 121.9 | 122.0 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Correr Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 210 | 98 | 79 | 105 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 151 | 75 | 171 | 80 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corne Area per Ped (sq.ft) | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | - | - | - | - |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | 2.66 | 2.39 | 3.50 | 3.51 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS | C | B | C | D |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh/h) | 506 | 340 | 1628 | 1662 |
| Effct. Green for Bike (s) | 40.4 | 40.4 | 81.8 | 72.2 |
| Cross street Width (ft) | 121.9 | 122.0 | 34.1 | 34.0 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 505 | 505 | 1023 | 902 |
| Bicycle Delay (s/bike) | 44.7 | 44.7 | 19.1 | 24.1 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.83 | 3.56 | 1.90 | 1.92 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | D | B | B |



Splits and Phases: 3: Nova Rd \& Madeline Ave


3: Nova Rd \& Madeline Ave

| Direction | All |
| :--- | ---: |
| Future Volume (vph) | 3208 |
| Total Delay (hr) | 31 |
| Stops (\#) | 2365 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 13 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 44 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 587 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 76 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.7 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 103 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 45.1 | 45.0 | 122.7 | 122.5 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 113 | 66 | 62 | 112 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 92 | 36 | 149 | 130 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corne Area per Ped (sq.ft) | - | - | - | - |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 | 61.7 |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | 2.55 | 2.42 | 3.36 | 3.44 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS | C | B | C | C |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh/h) | 416 | 382 | 1565 | 1202 |
| Effct. Green for Bike (s) | 27.1 | 20.4 | 73.2 | 68.9 |
| Cross Street Width (ft) | 122.7 | 122.5 | 45.0 | 45.1 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 361 | 272 | 976 | 919 |
| Bicycle Delay (s/bike) | 50.3 | 56.0 | 19.7 | 21.9 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.69 | 3.64 | 2.04 | 1.84 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | D | B | B |



Splits and Phases: 3: Nova Rd \& Madeline Ave


Network Totals

| Number of Intersections | 1 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total Delay (hr) | 49 |
| Stops (\#) | 3241 |
| Average Speed (mph) | 12 |
| Total Travel Time (hr) | 65 |
| Distance Traveled (mi) | 757 |
| Fuel Consumed (gal) | 107 |
| Fuel Economy (mpg) | 7.1 |
| Unserved Vehicles (\#) | 0 |
| Vehicles in dilemma zone (\#) | 126 |
| Performance Index | 57.9 |


|  | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Approach | 45.1 | 45.0 | 122.7 | 122.5 |
| Crosswalk Length (ft) | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Crosswalk Width (ft) | 4 | 4 | 7 | 7 |
| Total Number of Lanes Crossed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of Right-Turn Islands | Actuated Actuated Actuated Actuated |  |  |  |
| Type of Control | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4 |
| Corresponding Signal Phase | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 |
| Effective Walk Time (s) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size A (ft) | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 9.0 |
| Right Corner Size B (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corner Curb Radius (ft) | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 | 81.00 |
| Right Corner Total Area (sq.ft) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Left-Right Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. Right-Left Flow Rate (p/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ped. R. Sidewalk Flow Rate (p/h) | 210 | 95 | 79 | 105 |
| Veh. Perm. L. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 151 | 75 | 171 | 80 |
| Veh. Perm. R. Flow in Walk (v/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Veh. RTOR Flow in Walk (v/h) | 35 | 35 | 50 | 50 |
| 85th percentile speed (mph) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Right Corne Area per Ped (sq.ft) | 0.0 | - |  |  |
| Right Corner Quality of Service | - | - | - | - |
| Ped. Circulation Area (sq.ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Crosswalk Circulation Code | - | - | - | - |
| Pedestrian Delay (s/p) | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 | 66.6 |
| Pedestrian Compliance Code | Poor | Poor | Poor | Poor |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk Score | 2.75 | 2.50 | 3.50 | 3.51 |
| Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS | C | C | C | D |


| Approach | EB | WB | NB | SB |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Bicycle Flow Rate (bike/h) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Flow Rate (veh/h) | 506 | 340 | 1628 | 1659 |
| Effct. Green for Bike (s) | 25.6 | 23.2 | 80.9 | 70.5 |
| Cross Street Width (ft) | 122.7 | 122.5 | 45.0 | 45.1 |
| Through Lanes Number | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 |
| Through Lane Width (ft) | 11.0 | 11.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 |
| Bicycle Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
| Striped Parking Lane Width (ft) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paved Shoulder Width (ft) | 3.0 | 3.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Curb Is Present? | No | No | No | No |
| On Street Parking? | No | No | No | No |
| Bicycle Lane Capacity (bike/h) | 320 | 290 | 1011 | 881 |
| Bicycle Delay (s/bike) | 56.4 | 58.5 | 19.6 | 25.0 |
| Bicycle Compliance | Poor | Poor | Fair | Fair |
| Bicycle LOS Score | 3.84 | 3.57 | 2.07 | 2.09 |
| Bicycle LOS | D | D | B | B |

## APPENDIX F:

Supporting Documentation for B/C Analysis

# FDOT Long Range Estimating System - Production R3: Project Details by Sequence Report 

Project: 101010-1-52-01
Letting Date: 01/2099
Description: VHB Project\# 663308.06 Madeline Avenue


## X-Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $110-1-1$ | CLEARING \& GRUBBING | 0.31 AC | $\$ 26,786.74$ | $\$ 8,303.89$ |
| $120-1$ | REGULAR EXCAVATION | 251.00 CY | $\$ 32.84$ | $\$ 8,242.84$ |
| $120-6$ | EMBANKMENT | 125.00 CY | $\$ 35.42$ | $\$ 4,427.50$ |

Earthwork Component Total
\$20,974.23

## ROADWAY COMPONENT

## User Input Data

## Description

Number of Lanes
Existing Roadway Pavement Width L/R
Structural Spread Rate
Friction Course Spread Rate
Widened Outside Pavement Width L/R
Widened Structural Spread Rate
Widened Friction Course Spread Rate75165

| X-Items |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price | Extended Amount |
| 285-706 | OPTIONAL BASE,BASE GROUP 06 | 633.00 SY | \$47.32 | \$29,953.56 |
| 327-70-1 | MILLING EXIST ASPH PAVT, 1" AVG DEPTH | 146.00 SY | \$10.33 | \$1,508.18 |
| 327-70-6 | MILLING EXIST ASPH PAVT, 1 1/2" AVG DEPTH | 1,918.00 SY | \$1.76 | \$3,375.68 |
| 334-1-12 | SUPERPAVE ASPHALTIC CONC, TRAFFIC B | 8.00 TN | \$144.47 | \$1,155.76 |
| 334-1-13 | SUPERPAVE ASPHALTIC CONC, TRAFFIC C | 52.00 TN | \$133.02 | \$6,917.04 |
| 337-7-83 | ASPH CONC FC,TRAFFIC C,FC12.5,PG 76-22 | 210.00 TN | \$127.45 | \$26,764.50 |
| 710-11-101 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID,6" | 0.28 GM | \$1,098.71 | \$307.64 |
| 710-11-123 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID, 12" | 154.00 LF | \$1.11 | \$170.94 |
| 710-11-125 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID,24" | 149.00 LF | \$2.12 | \$315.88 |
| 710-11-131 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SKIP, 6" | 0.01 GM | \$511.79 | \$5.12 |
| 710-11-201 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,YELLOW,SOLID,6" | 0.33 GM | \$1,074.80 | \$354.68 |
| 710-11-224 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,YELLOW,SOLID,18" | 232.00 LF | \$1.57 | \$364.24 |
| 711-11-170 | THERMOPLASTIC, STD, WHITE, ARROW | 5.00 EA | \$67.65 | \$338.25 |

## Pavement Marking Subcomponent

| Description | Value |
| :--- | ---: |
| Include Thermo/Tape/Other | N |
| Pavement Type | Asphalt |
| Solid Stripe No. of Paint Applications | 2 |
| Solid Stripe No. of Stripes | 2 |
| Skip Stripe No. of Paint Applications | 2 |
| Skip Stripe No. of Stripes | 1 |

Roadway Component Total

## SHOULDER COMPONENT

## User Input Data

| Description | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| Existing Total Outside Shoulder Width L/R | 10.00 / 10.00 |
| New Total Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $10.00 / 10.00$ |
| Total Outside Shoulder Perf. Turf Width L/R | 2.67 / 2.67 |
| Existing Paved Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $5.00 / 5.00$ |
| New Paved Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $5.00 / 5.00$ |
| Structural Spread Rate | 110 |
| Friction Course Spread Rate | 80 |
| Total Width (T) / 8" Overlap (O) | T |
| Rumble Strips ï $^{112}$ No. of Sides | 0 |

## X-Items

Pay item Description Quantity Unit Unit Price Extended Amount
520-1-10 CONCRETE CURB \& GUTTER, TYPE F

| $520-2-4$ | CONCRETE CURB, TYPE D | 38.00 LF | $\$ 33.25$ | $\$ 1,263.50$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $520-3$ | VALLEY GUTTER- CONCRETE | 60.00 LF | $\$ 48.95$ | $\$ 2,937.00$ |
| $522-1$ | CONCRETE SIDEWALK AND | 121.00 SY | $\$ 56.71$ | $\$ 6,861.91$ |
|  | DRIVEWAYS, 4" |  |  |  |
| $522-2$ | CONCRETE SIDEWALK AND | 54.00 SY | $\$ 66.98$ | $\$ 3,616.92$ |
| $570-1-2$ | DRIVEWAYS, 6" | PERFORMANCE TURF, SOD | 472.00 SY | $\$ 3.97$ |

## Erosion Control

Pay Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| 104-10-3 | SEDIMENT BARRIER | 528.00 LF | $\$ 1.49$ | $\$ 786.72$ |
| $104-18$ | INLET PROTECTION SYSTEM | 2.00 EA | $\$ 104.09$ | $\$ 208.18$ |
| $107-1$ | LITTER REMOVAL | 1.00 AC | $\$ 33.96$ | $\$ 33.96$ |
| $107-2$ | MOWING | 0.50 AC | $\$ 52.03$ | $\$ 26.02$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 23,243.52$ |

DRAINAGE COMPONENT

| X-Items |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| 425-1-361 | INLETS, CURB, TYPE P-6, <10' | 1.00 EA | $\$ 7,563.48$ | $\$ 7,563.48$ |
| $425-2-63$ | MANHOLES, P-8, PARTIAL | 1.00 EA | $\$ 5,466.05$ | $\$ 5,466.05$ |
| $430-174-118$ | PIPE CULV, OPT MATL, | 16.00 LF | $\$ 144.25$ | $\$ 2,308.00$ |
|  | ROUND,18"SD |  |  | $\$ 15,337.53$ |

## SIGNING COMPONENT

## Pay Items

Pay item Description
700-1-11

SINGLE POST SIGN, F\&I GM, <12 SF

Quantity Unit Unit Price Extended Amount
3.00 AS $\$ 413.04 \quad \$ 1,239.12$

Signing Component Total
\$1,239.12

Sequence 1 Total

Sequence: 2 WUR - Widen/Resurface, Undivided, Rural
Net Length: $\begin{array}{r}0.096 \mathrm{MI} \\ 504 \mathrm{LF}\end{array}$
Description: Madeline (Westbound)

EARTHWORK COMPONENT

## User Input Data

| Description | Value |
| :--- | ---: |
| Standard Clearing and Grubbing Limits L/R | $30.00 / 30.00$ |
| Incidental Clearing and Grubbing Area | 0.00 |

Alignment Number 1
Distance 0.096
Top of Structural Course For Begin Section 102.00
Top of Structural Course For End Section 102.00
Horizontal Elevation For Begin Section 100.00

Existing Front Slope L/R
Existing Outside Shoulder Cross Slope L/R
Front Slope L/R
Outside Shoulder Cross Slope L/R
Roadway Cross Slope L/R

6 to $1 / 6$ to 1 $6.00 \% / 6.00 \%$

## X-Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $110-1-1$ | CLEARING \& GRUBBING | 0.40 AC | $\$ 26,786.74$ | $\$ 10,714.70$ |
| $120-1$ | REGULAR EXCAVATION | 285.00 CY | $\$ 32.84$ | $\$ 9,359.40$ |
| $120-6$ | EMBANKMENT | 143.00 CY | $\$ 35.42$ | $\$ 5,065.06$ |
|  |  |  |  | $\$ 25,139.16$ |

## ROADWAY COMPONENT

| User Input Data |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description |  | Value |  |  |
| Number of Lanes |  | 2 |  |  |
| Existing Roadway Pavement Width L/R |  | 10.00 / 10.00 |  |  |
| Structural Spread Rate |  | 165 |  |  |
| Friction Course Spread Rate |  | 80 |  |  |
| Widened Outside Pavement Width L/R |  | $2.00 / 2.00$ |  |  |
| Widened Structural Spread Rate |  | 275 |  |  |
| Widened Friction Course Spread Rate |  | 165 |  |  |
| X-Items |  |  |  |  |
| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price | ded Amount |
| 285-706 | OPTIONAL BASE,BASE GROUP 06 | 550.00 SY | \$47.32 | \$26,026.00 |
| 327-70-6 | MILLING EXIST ASPH PAVT,1 1/2" AVG DEPTH | 1,609.00 SY | \$1.76 | \$2,831.84 |
| 334-1-13 | SUPERPAVE ASPHALTIC CONC, TRAFFIC C | 45.00 TN | \$133.02 | \$5,985.90 |
| 337-7-83 | ASPH CONC FC,TRAFFIC C,FC12.5,PG 76-22 | 178.00 TN | \$127.45 | \$22,686.10 |
| 710-11-101 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID,6" | 0.26 GM | \$1,098.71 | \$285.66 |
| 710-11-123 | PAINTED PAVT <br> MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID, 12" | 103.00 LF | \$1.11 | \$114.33 |
| 710-11-125 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SOLID,24" | 125.00 LF | \$2.12 | \$265.00 |
| 710-11-131 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE,SKIP, 6" | 0.02 GM | \$511.79 | \$10.24 |
| 710-11-170 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,WHITE, ARROWS | 5.00 EA | \$36.68 | \$183.40 |
| 710-11-201 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,YELLOW,SOLID,6" | 0.24 GM | \$1,074.80 | \$257.95 |
| 710-11-224 | PAINTED PAVT MARK,STD,YELLOW,SOLID,18" | 93.00 LF | \$1.57 | \$146.01 |

## Pavement Marking Subcomponent

| Description | Value |
| :--- | ---: |
| Include Thermo/Tape/Other | N |
| Pavement Type | Asphalt |
| Solid Stripe No. of Paint Applications | 2 |
| Solid Stripe No. of Stripes | 2 |
| Skip Stripe No. of Paint Applications | 2 |

## SHOULDER COMPONENT

## User Input Data

| Description | Value |
| :--- | ---: |
| Existing Total Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $10.00 / 10.00$ |
| New Total Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $10.00 / 10.00$ |
| Total Outside Shoulder Perf. Turf Width L/R | $2.67 / 2.67$ |
| Existing Paved Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $5.00 / 5.00$ |
| New Paved Outside Shoulder Width L/R | $5.00 / 5.00$ |
| Structural Spread Rate | 110 |
| Friction Course Spread Rate | 80 |
| Total Width (T) / 8" Overlap (O) | T |
| Rumble Strips ï¿½No. of Sides | 0 |

## X-Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| $520-1-10$ | CONCRETE CURB \& GUTTER, | 841.00 LF | $\$ 31.66$ | $\$ 26,626.06$ |
|  | TYPE F |  |  |  |
| $522-1$ | CONCRETE SIDEWALK AND | 388.00 SY | $\$ 56.71$ | $\$ 22,003.48$ |
| $522-2$ | DRIVEWAYS, 4" |  |  |  |
| $570-1-2$ | CONCRETE SIDEWALK AND | 63.00 SY | $\$ 66.98$ | $\$ 4,219.74$ |
|  | DRIVEWAYS, 6" | 706.00 SY | $\$ 3.97$ | $\$ 2,802.82$ |

## Erosion Control

Pay Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $104-10-3$ | SEDIMENT BARRIER | 835.00 LF | $\$ 1.49$ | $\$ 1,244.15$ |
| $104-12$ | STAKED TURBIDITY BARRIER- | 24.00 LF | $\$ 5.29$ | $\$ 126.96$ |
| $104-18$ | NYL REINF PVC | 4.00 EA | $\$ 104.09$ | $\$ 416.36$ |
| $107-1$ | INLET PROTECTION SYSTEM | 0.44 AC | $\$ 33.96$ | $\$ 14.94$ |
| $107-2$ | LITTER REMOVAL | 0.22 AC | $\$ 52.03$ | $\$ 11.45$ |
|  | MOWING |  |  | $\$ 57,465.96$ |

DRAINAGE COMPONENT
X-Items

| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 425-1-361 | INLETS, CURB, TYPE P-6, <10' | 3.00 EA | $\$ 7,563.48$ | $\$ 22,690.44$ |
| 425-2-63 | MANHOLES, P-8, PARTIAL | 3.00 EA | $\$ 5,466.05$ | $\$ 16,398.15$ |
| $430-174-124$ | PIPE CULV, OPT MATL, | 320.00 LF | $\$ 132.37$ | $\$ 42,358.40$ |
|  | ROUND,24"SD |  |  |  |
| $430-984-129$ | MITERED END SECT, OPTIONAL | 1.00 EA | $\$ 2,299.56$ | $\$ 2,299.56$ |
|  | RD, 24" SD |  |  | $\$ 83,746.55$ |


| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price Extended Amount |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $700-1-11$ | SINGLE POST SIGN, F\&I GM, <12 | 3.00 AS | $\$ 413.04$ | $\$ 1,239.12$ |
|  | SF |  |  | $\$ 1,239.12$ |

Date: 1/27/2022 1:22:09 PM

# FDOT Long Range Estimating System - Production R3: Project Details by Sequence Report 

Project: 101010-1-52-01
Letting Date: 01/2099
Description: VHB Project\# 663308.06 Madeline Avenue

| District: 05 | County: 79 VOLUSIA | Market Area: 06 | Units: English |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Contract Class: | Lump Sum Project: N | Design/Build: N | Project Length: 0.232 MI |

Project Manager:

Version 45 Project Grand Total
\$455,739.90
Description: Madeline Avenue

| Project Sequences Subtotal |  |  |  | \$358,709.09 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 102-1 | Maintenance of Traffic | 10.00 \% |  | \$35,870.91 |
| 101-1 | Mobilization | 10.00 \% |  | \$39,458.00 |
| Project Sequences Total |  |  |  | \$434,038.00 |
| Project Unknowns |  | 0.00 \% |  | \$0.00 |
| Design/Build |  | 0.00 \% |  | \$0.00 |
| Non-Bid Components: |  |  |  |  |
| Pay item | Description | Quantity Unit | Unit Price | Extended Amount |
| 999-25 | InItiAl Contingency Amount (DO NOT BID) | LS | \$21,701.90 | \$21,701.90 |
| Project Non-Bid Subtotal |  |  |  | \$21,701.90 |
| Version 45 Project Grand Total |  |  |  | \$455,739.90 |

PRELIMINARY COST ESTIMATE - SIGNAL
Madeline Avenue at Nova Road Intersection Improvements

| Pay Item | Pay Item Description | Unit | Quantity | Unit Price | Total Cost |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 630-2-11 | CONDUIT, FURNISH \& INSTALL, OPEN TRENCH | LF | 250 | \$13.45 | \$3,362.50 |
| 630-2-12 | CONDUIT, FURNISH \& INSTALL, DIRECTIONAL BORE | LF | 500 | \$26.75 | \$13,375.00 |
| 632-7-1 | SIGNAL CABLE- NEW OR RECONSTRUCTED INTERSECTION, FURNISH \& INSTALL | PI | 1 | \$7,010.00 | \$7,010.00 |
| 633-8-1 | MULTI-CONDUCTOR COMMUNICATION CABLE, FURNISH \& INSTALL | LF | 150 | \$5.70 | \$855.00 |
| 635-2-11 | PULL \& SPLICE BOX, F\&I, 13" $\times 24$ " COVER SIZE | EA | 20 | \$915.00 | \$18,300.00 |
| 635-2-12 | PULL \& SPLICE BOX, F\&I, 24" $\times 36$ " COVER SIZE | EA | 2 | \$1,810.00 | \$3,620.00 |
| 646-1-11 | ALUMINUM SIGNALS POLE, PEDESTAL | EA | 8 | \$1,800.00 | \$14,400.00 |
| 649-21-21 | STEEL MAST ARM ASSEMBLY, FURNISH AND INSTALL, SINGLE ARM 78' | EA | 1 | \$81,000.00 | \$81,000.00 |
| 649-21-27 | STEEL MAST ARM ASSEMBLY, FURNISH AND INSTALL, DOUBLE ARM 78'78' | EA | 1 | \$105,550.00 | \$105,550.00 |
| 649-26-3 | STEEL MAST ARM ASSEMBLY, REMOVE, SHALLOW FOUNDATION - BOLT ON ATTACHMENT | EA | 2 | \$4,255.00 | \$8,510.00 |
| 650-1-14 | VEHICULAR TRAFFIC SIGNAL (F\&I- ALUMINUM) (3 SECTION, 1 WAY) | AS | 12 | \$1,145.00 | \$13,740.00 |
| 650-1-46 | VEHICULAR TRAFFIC SIGNAL, FURNISH \& INSTALL PROGRAMMABLE, (4 SECTION, 1 WAY) | EA | 2 | \$5,775.00 | \$11,550.00 |
| 653-1-11 | PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL, FURNISH \& INSTALL LED COUNTDOWN, 1 WAY | AS | 6 | \$785.00 | \$4,710.00 |
| 653-1-12 | PEDESTRIAN SIGNAL, FURNISH \& INSTALL LED COUNTDOWN, 2 WAY | AS | 3 | \$1,380.00 | \$4,140.00 |
| 665-1-11 | PEDESTRIAN DETECTOR, FURNISH \& INSTALL, STANDARD | EA | 12 | \$290.00 | \$3,480.00 |
| 660-4-11 | VEHICLE DETECTION SYSTEM- VIDEO, FURNISH \& INSTALL CABINENT EQUIPMENT | EA | 1 | \$11,005.00 | \$11,005.00 |
| 660-4-12 | VEHICLE DETECTION SYSTEM- VIDEO, FURNISH \& INSTALL ABOVE GROUND EQUIPMENT | EA | 4 | \$5,110.00 | \$20,440.00 |
| 663-1-111 | SIGNAL PRIORITY AND PREEMPTION SYSTEM (F\&I) (OPTICAL) (CABINET ELECTRONICS) | EA | 1 | \$5,665.00 | \$5,665.00 |
| 663-1-112 | SIGNAL PRIORITY AND PREEMPTION SYSTEM (F\&\&I) (OPTICAL) (DETECTORS) | EA | 4 | \$1,770.00 | \$7,080.00 |
| 682-1400 | ITS CCTV CAMERA, RELOCATE (Existing Grid Smart Camera) | EA | 1 | \$2,000.00 | \$2,000.00 |
| 700-5-22 | INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGN (F\&I- OVERHEAD MOUNT) (12 SF TO 18 SF) | EA | 4 | \$4,050.00 | \$16,200.00 |
| 715-1-12 | LIGHTING CONDUCTORS, F\&I, INSULATED, NO.8-6 | LF | 4,176 | \$2.50 | \$10,440.00 |
| 715-4-13 | LIGHT POLE COMPLETE, FURNISH \& INSTALL STANDARD POLE STANDARD FOUNDATION, 40' MOUNTING HEIGHT | EA | 8 | \$7,765.00 | \$62,120.00 |
| 715-4-70 | LIGHT POLE COMPLETE, REMOVE POLE AND FOUNDATION | EA | 8 | \$840.00 | \$6,720.00 |
| 715-500-1 | POLE CABLE DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, FURNISH AND INSTALL, CONVENTIONAL | EA | 8 | \$815.00 | \$6,520.00 |

[^1]SUBTOTAL
$\$ 441,792.50$
MOBILIZATION (10\%)
$\$ 44,179.25$

| MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC (10\%) | $\$ 48,597.18$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| PROJECT UNKNOWNS (10\%) | $\$ 44,179.25$ |

[^2]TRANSPORTATION

## Inflation Factors

This "Transportation Costs" report is issued by the Office of Policy Planning. It provides information on inflation factors and other indices that may be used to convert Present Day Costs (PDC) to future Year Of Expenditure costs (YOE) or vice versa. This report is updated regularly based on the FDOT Work Program Instructions.

Please note that the methodology for inflationary adjustments relating to specific transportation projects should be addressed with the district office where the project will be located. For general use or non-specific areas, the guidelines provided herein may be used for inflationary adjustments.

## Construction Cost Inflation Factors

The table on the next page includes the inflation factors and Present Day Cost (PDC) multipliers that are applied to the Department's Work Program for highway construction costs expressed in Fiscal Year 2022 dollars (FY 2022 runs from July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022).

## Other Transportation Cost Inflation Factors

Other indices may be used to adjust project costs for other transportation modes or nonconstruction components of costs. Examples are as follows:

The Consumer Price Index (CPI, also retail price index) is a weighted average of prices of a specified set of products and services purchased by wage earners in urban areas. As such, it provides one measure of inflation. The CPI is a fixed quantity price index and a reasonable cost-of-living index.

The Employment Cost Index (ECI) is based on the National Compensation Survey, administered by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). It measures quarterly changes in compensation costs, which include wages, salaries, and other employer costs for civilian workers (nonfarm private industry and state and local government).

The monthly series, Producer Price Index for Highway and Street Construction, is also available from BLS. It provides national-level estimates of past and recent highway construction inflation. The Producer Price Index (PPI) web site is http://www.bls.gov/ppi/home.htm.

Work Program
Highway Construction Cost Inflation Factors

| Fiscal Year | Inflation Factor | PDC Multiplier |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2022 | Base | 1.000 |
| 2023 | 2.7\% | 1.027 |
| 2024 | 2.8\% | 1.056 |
| 2025 | 2.9\% | 1.086 |
| 2026 | 3.0\% | 1.119 |
| 2027 | 3.1\% | 1.154 |
| 2028 | 3.2\% | 1.191 |
| 2029 | 3.3\% | 1.230 |
| 2030 | 3.3\% | 1.270 |
| 2031 | 3.3\% | 1.312 |
| 2032 | 3.3\% | 1.356 |
| 2033 | 3.3\% | 1.400 |
| 2034 | 3.3\% | 1.447 |
| 2035 | 3.3\% | 1.494 |
| 2036 | 3.3\% | 1.544 |
| 2037 | 3.3\% | 1.595 |
| 2038 | 3.3\% | 1.647 |
| 2039 | 3.3\% | 1.702 |
| 2040 | 3.3\% | 1.758 |
| 2041 | 3.3\% | 1.816 |
| 2042 | 3.3\% | 1.876 |
| 2043 | 3.3\% | 1.938 |
| 2044 | 3.3\% | 2.002 |
| 2045 | 3.3\% | 2.068 |
| 2046 | 3.3\% | 2.136 |
| 2047 | 3.3\% | 2.206 |
| 2048 | 3.3\% | 2.279 |
| 2049 | 3.3\% | 2.354 |
| 2050 | 3.3\% | 2.432 |
| 2051 | 3.3\% | 2.512 |
| 2052 | 3.3\% | 2.595 |
| 2053 | 3.3\% | 2.681 |
| 2054 | 3.3\% | 2.769 |
| 2055 | 3.3\% | 2.861 |
| 2056 | 3.3\% | 2.955 |
| 2057 | 3.3\% | 3.053 |
| 2058 | 3.3\% | 3.153 |
| 2059 | 3.3\% | 3.257 |


| Operational Benefits Summary |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benefit Period |  | Measures of Effectiveness |  |
|  |  | Total Delay (vehhrs) | Fuel Consumption (gal) |
| AM Peak Hour | 2025 No Build | 37.0 | 77.0 |
|  | 2025 Build | 31.0 | 76.0 |
| PM Peak Hour | 2025 No Build | 54.0 | 108.0 |
|  | 2025 Build | 49.0 | 107.0 |
| Estimated Daily (AM+ PM) | 2025 No Build | 91 | 185 |
|  | 2025 Build | 80 | 183 |
| Estimated Daily Savings [4*(AM + PM)] |  | 44 | 8 |
| Estimated Unit Cost |  | \$20.170 | \$4.110 |
| Daily User Benefit by MOE |  | \$887.480 | \$32.880 |
| Daily User Benefit Total |  | 920.36 |  |
| Annual User Benefit |  | \$276,108.00 |  |
| The service life of the improvement was kept as twenty (20) years. <br> Interest rate of $4 \%$ was used in arriving at the annual cost of improvements. |  |  |  |


| Project Cost (2022) |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Roadway | Signal | Total |  |
| Sub-Total |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 358,709.09$ | $\$ 441,792.50$ | $\$ 1,070,358.98$ |  |
| MOT | $10 \%$ | $\$ 35,870.91$ | $\$ 44,179.25$ |  |  |
| Mobilization | $10 \%$ | $\$ 39,458.00$ | $\$ 48,597.18$ |  |  |
| Unknowns | $10 \%$ | $\$ 35,870.91$ | $\$ 44,179.25$ |  |  |
| Initial Contingency Amount | - | $\$ 21,701.90$ | - |  |  |
| Total |  | $\$ 491,610.81$ | $\$ 578,748.18$ |  |  |


| Adjusted Project Costs |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Intlation <br> Eactor | Multiplier | Roadway Cost | Signal Cost | Total |  |  |
| 2022 | Base | 1.000 | $\$ 491,610.81$ | $\$ 578,748.18$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 7 0 , 3 5 8 . 9 8}$ |  |  |
| 2023 | $2.70 \%$ | 1.027 | $\$ 504,884.30$ | $\$ 594,374.38$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 9 9 , 2 5 8 . 6 8}$ |  |  |
| 2024 | $2.80 \%$ | 1.056 | $\$ 519,141.01$ | $\$ 611,158.07$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 3 0 , 2 9 9 . 0 9}$ |  |  |
| 2025 | $2.90 \%$ | 1.086 | $\$ 533,889.34$ | $\$ 628,520.52$ | $\mathbf{\$ 1 , 1 6 2 , 4 0 9 . 8 6}$ |  |  |

Interest rate of 4\% was used in arriving at the annual cost of improvements.

Florida's Transportation Engineers
Rev. 02/2014

## Benefit-Cost Analysis

District: Five County: 79-Volusia Date Prepared: 04/11/22

Location: Madeline Ave \& Nova Rd

Section :
Beg. Milepost :
Type: $\quad \mathbf{2 - 3}$ Lanes Urban UnDivided
$\square$ End Milepost :
Rdway Type: 2-3 Lanes Urban UnDivided

## Control Element: Other (describe in box below)

Turn Lane/Signal Improvements

ANNUAL COST OF IMPROVEMENTS
Capital
Service Recovery

| Type | Cost |  | Life | Factor | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROW |  |  | 100 | 0.0408 | \$ | - |
| P.E.C.E.I. |  |  | 15 | 0.0899 | \$ | - |
| Structure |  |  | 75 | 0.0425 | \$ | - |
| Roadway | \$ | 533,889.34 | 20 | 0.0736 | \$ | 39,294.26 |
| Drainage |  |  | 20 | 0.0736 | \$ | - |
| Signal | \$ | 628,520.52 | 20 | 0.0736 | \$ | 46,259.11 |
| Other |  |  | 20 | 0.0736 | \$ | - |
| Sub-Total | \$ | 1,162,409.86 |  |  | \$ | 85,553.37 |
|  |  |  |  | ual Cost $=$ | \$ | 85,553.37 |


| Total number of crashes $=$ | 64 | Primary crash reduction factor (\%): |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| \# of correctable crashes, $\mathrm{PC}=$ | 18 | Change permissive to protected-only phasing for EBL and WBL |
| \# of years of crash data, YD $=$ | 5 |  |
| PC/YD $=$ | 3.60 | Additional crash reduction factor: |
| Crash reduction factor, CRF $=$ | $99.00 \%$ |  |
| CRF x $(\mathrm{PC} / \mathrm{YD})=$ | 3.56 |  |
| Cost per crash, CPC $=$ | $\$ 124,618.00$ | Additional crash reduction factor: |
| Safety Benefit $=$ | $\$ 444,139$ |  |
| Operational Benefit $=$ | $\$ 276,108$ |  |

BENEFIT/COST RATIO

$$
\frac{\text { Benefit }}{\text { Cost }}=\frac{\$ 720,246.55}{\$ 85,553.37}=\mathbf{8 . 4 2}
$$

[^3]Prepared by: VHB


[^0]:    Note: * V/C Ratio - Volume over count ratio; The maximum value is reported for each movement and the overall intersection

[^1]:    Notes:

    1. Unit prices based on current FDOT 6 Month Moving Statewide Averages
    2. Estimate assumes new mast arms due to EB right turn lane improvement \& structural analysis not meeting current design standards with additional loadings
    3. Estimate includes enhanced pedestrian lighting at the intersection
[^2]:    TOTAL SIGNAL ESTIMATED PROJECT COSTS $\$ 578,748.18$

[^3]:    1) A Crash Reduction Factor of $99 \%$ was used based CMF ID 333 from the cmfclearinghouse.org (Accident Modification Factors for Traffic Engineering and ITS Improvements, Harkey Et Al., 2008); 2) Left and Angle crashes were assumed to be correctable because of the capacity/signal improvements; 3) Operations benefits of $\$ 276,108.00$ was added to the safety benefits to get the overall B/C Rati0; 4) Construction cost is represented in 2025 dollar value based on a inflation factor of ? 00/
